

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE are glad that Principal John OMAN, D.D., has revised and re-issued *Vision and Authority* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 8s. 6d. net). For, although it originated in thoughts and feelings that were stirred by the Robertson Smith controversy, and was first published in 1902, it is a book that might have been written to-day. Neither in form nor in substance does it reflect that controversy. But the author hints that, if the book had been written to-day, it would have been less 'intuitional' and more 'rational' in tone.

The main subject of the book is 'the true religious authority and the kind of person who exercises it,' and it is well suggested in the sub-title, 'The Throne of St. Peter.' Not that the Principal of Westminster College appears here in the rôle of a defender of the Papal authority. On the contrary, he seeks to emphasize the note of freedom that was struck, but not deeply enough, at the Protestant Reformation. The true successor of St. Peter, and the heir of his authority, is neither an infallible Church nor an infallible Book.

It is, in fact, the burden of Dr. OMAN's work that the real authority of religion is to be found, not in the potentate who sits on the throne of the Cæsars, nor in the prelate enthroned at Canterbury, nor in the stern presbyter who rules his Highland glen, but in him who, be he potentate or prelate or presbyter, owes his apostolic succession to his vision of the kingdom of love. 'And the authority

of this vision is what alone it will be of profit to restore.'

It might be noted that the book falls into four parts, namely, The Internal Authority, The External Authority, The Church's Creed, and The Church's Organization. It might also be said that it is written in a style which is compact, suggestive, and pointed, often vivid and eloquent, and which may be readily understood by ordinary people. The absence of technicalities is in this case a sign of independence of thought.

If we select one of the most theological portions of the book, it will serve to show the popular way in which the author can express his religious thinking. But this portion—the 'Four Veils'—should also be of interest and help to the expositor, showing as it does how the revelation of the Divine love removes the ignorance, sin, weakness, and evanescence that shut men out from the mystery of God.

First, there is the veil of ignorance, which is removed by the Incarnation. If God manifests Himself in our human form, even the ignorance of the unlearned need not be a hindrance to knowledge of God. But Dr. OMAN does not encourage us to speculate on the mode of the Incarnation. If to do so could yield us practical fruit in the knowledge of God, 'would it ever have been necessary at all to teach us, like children at God's footstool, the mystery of godliness by the condescending mani-

festation of God in the flesh? For beings who could sit inside the heavenly council and differentiate the Divine essence and map out the Divine scheme an Incarnation were a superfluity.'

The second veil is that of sin, which is removed by the Atonement. If God Himself reconciles us to Himself, our practical denial of His purpose of love may not ultimately hinder us from knowing it and loving it. Why is it, Dr. OMAN asks in this connexion, that, while all abstract presentations of the Atonement are unsatisfying, the presentation of the Apostles remains attractive and persuasive? 'Is not the very simple answer that the theologian always deals with the doctrine from without, and the Apostle always looks at it from within?' 'Love cannot be interpreted from the outside.'

The third veil is weakness, which is removed by Grace. If God Himself is our strength, no weakness need make us despair of the highest victory. Here, again, we would fain know by seeing, by sight, how the enshrouding veil is taken away. 'The working of Grace, however, cannot be known before we have experience of it. We cannot, without rising to the height of its embrace, determine how it enfolds us. But then we find it singularly free from perplexity. Without any sense of incompatibility we are enabled to place the largest value that may be assigned to anything finite upon man's free choice, and at the same time to assign an absolute value to the Will that embraces all things.'

The fourth veil is evanescence, which is removed by Immortality. If in God we live eternally the shortness of our earthly life does not deny us our share in the final glory. Were we to know what lies beyond, the glory might dazzle, or the length of the journey dismay; in any case our present life would cease to be our immediate sphere of discipline and duty. Our true hope rests in the discovery that now we have eternal life. 'Utterly different the Future may be from all we have experienced. It may be in still greater contrast to all we have anticipated. Immeasurably it may be beyond our most daring imagination. Yet the Christian hope

has this assurance that it admits of no strong dividing line between this life and another.'

From all this it may be gathered that Dr. OMAN recognizes the limitations of theology, and that, if he had written his book to-day, it might have been more 'rational' in tone, but would not have been 'rationalistic': experience, he would say, is richer than thought, religion than theology.

A thoughtful writer in the 'Times Literary Supplement' hazarded the remark recently, 'Who can tell if the coming revival of religion so confidently predicted in certain quarters may not be waiting for the time when we are able to respond more vigorously to the presentation of the Gospel most intimately associated with St. Paul?' It may be so, for in the great historic revivals Paul's gospel has been much to the front. It is, therefore, with great expectation and hope that we welcome the appearance in English of Karl BARTH's *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Pilgrim Press; \$2.25). Rarely have we heard the Pauline note sounded with such tremendous earnestness and power. It is in many ways a difficult book. The style is often rugged and abrupt; it surges along brimful of passion with the force of a swollen mountain torrent. It is full of antitheses, contradictions, paradoxes, many of them thrown in, doubtless, in the desperate hope of awaking dead souls and dead churches to face the eternal reality. It is certain that many will repudiate with vehemence and indignation the viewpoint of this book, for it implies an utter condemnation of 'this present world' as a lost and fallen world. It may be that many who have not been brought up in the traditions of the Reformed Church will find something amazing and even repellent in its overwhelming insistence on the sovereignty of God and the utter dependence and insufficiency of man. But no one who reads this book can fail to hear in it the authentic voice of a prophet.

For here is a man who trembles at the word of God. Religion for him is Revelation and Re-

redemption. It is not man's search for God, but God's gracious approach to sinful man. This movement is essentially and from first to last miraculous. It is the bringing into this world of a miraculous new order. 'The many miracles of the Bible are only illustrations of this, *the* miracle. . . . The Bible without the *absolute* miracle is simply *not* the Bible. Some day people will smile at the pictures of Jesus which we have made acceptable to the cultured by purging them of miracle, even more than our eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have smiled at the miracle stories.' The Bible is the Word of God. Its content is not human thoughts about God, but Divine thoughts about men. 'The Bible tells us not how we should talk with God, but what He says to us; not how we find the way to Him, but how He has sought and found the way to us. . . . The Bible lifts us out of the old atmosphere of man to the portals of a new world, the world of God.'

But what of the human element in the Bible? What of the Higher Criticism? Karl BARTH is no fundamentalist in the controversial sense, but he is undoubtedly impatient with the pre-eminence which has been given so long to literary and historical questions. Taking these for granted, he says, let us *get on*. 'For it is too clear that intelligent and fruitful discussion of the Bible begins when the judgment as to its human, its historical and psychological character has been made and *put behind* us. Would that the teachers of our high and lower schools, and with them the progressive element among the clergy of our established churches, would forthwith resolve to have done with a battle that once had its time but has now *had it*.'

We want to come at the kernel, the special content of this human document, the Biblical object. At a glance we can see that the men of the Bible had a quite extraordinary mental attitude and interest. 'Always there is the same seeing of the invisible, the same hearing of the inaudible, the same incomprehensible but no less undeniable epidemic of standing still and looking up.' What can it mean? Surely this, that God has come with overpowering reality into their life. 'It can in

truth be no less than a *mysterium tremendum* that draws the men of the Bible before our eyes out and on to the edge of all experience, thought, and action, to the edge of time and history, and impels them to attempt to leap off into the air, where obviously no man can stand.'

One of the most heart-shaking chapters of this great book is on the need and promise of Christian preaching. The minister must be past all feeling who can read it unmoved, so profoundly does it reveal, not the difficulty, but the impossibility of his task. That task is to relate the Word of God to the problem of human life. 'Often enough these two magnitudes, life and the Bible, have risen before me (and still rise!) like Scylla and Charybdis. If *these* are the whence and whither of Christian preaching, who shall, who can, be a minister and preach?' On Sunday morning when the bells ring, what a strange and momentous situation faces the preacher. The presence of the congregation expresses the expectancy of the people. The deepest question of the human heart will no longer down, but breaks out in flame—is *it true*, all this talk of God and life eternal? 'Blood and tears, deepest despair and highest hope, a passionate longing to lay hold of that which, or rather of *Him* who, overcomes the world because He is its Creator and Redeemer, its beginning and ending and Lord, a passionate longing to have the *Word* spoken, *the* word which promises grace in judgment, life in death, and the beyond in the here and now, *God's* word—this it is which animates our church-goers, however lazy, bourgeois, or commonplace may be the manner in which they express their want in so-called real life. There is no wisdom in stopping at the next-to-the-last and the next-to-the-next-to-the-last want of the people; and they will not thank us for doing so.' And over against that there is the greater expectancy of God, symbolized in the opening of the Bible. 'If the congregation brings to church the great question of human life and seeks an answer for it, the Bible contrariwise brings an answer, and seeks the question corresponding to this answer. It seeks questioning people who are eager to find and able to understand that its seeking of them is the very answer to their question. . . .

It is expectant of people who in its question will recognize their own question as well as God's answer—a final answer, which redeems, recreates, enlivens, and makes happy; an answer which casts the light of eternity upon time and all things in time, an answer which generates hope and obedience.'

The event towards which this momentous expectancy is directed from both sides is Christian preaching. 'It is simply a truism that there is nothing more important, more urgent, more helpful, more redemptive, and more salutary; there is nothing, from the viewpoint of heaven or earth, more relevant to the real situation, than the speaking and hearing of the Word of God.' But what peril inheres in this situation for the preacher! 'What are you doing, you man, with the Word of God upon your lips? Upon what ground do you assume the rôle of mediator between heaven and earth? Who has authorised you to take your place there and to generate religious feeling? And, to crown all, to do so with results, with success? Did one ever hear such overweening presumption, such Titanism, or—to speak less classically but more clearly—such brazenness! . . . Can a minister be saved? I would answer that with men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible. God may pluck us as a brand out of the fire. But so far as *we* know, there is no one who deserves the wrath of God more abundantly than the ministers. We may as well acknowledge that *we* are under judgment—and I mean judgment not in any spiritual, religious, or otherwise innocuous sense, but in the utmost realism.' There is no judgment that the world can pass upon us, however bitter and severe, which can equal our own sense of condemnation as soon as we realize what we have been attempting to do and in what manner we have been doing it. 'Ought we, taking our stand against the world, against unchristian views of life, and against the unreligious masses, to have been flinging out accusations which we have not first applied in their full weight to our own selves—and applied so forcibly as to have squeezed out of us what breath we had for condemning others? . . . We are worthy of being believed only as we are

aware of our own unworthiness. There is no such thing as convincing utterance about God except as Christian preaching feels its *need*, takes up its *cross*, and asks the *question* which God demands in order to be able to answer it. From this need we may not hope to flee.'

Among the bright stars in that constellation, the Church Congress of 1928, one of the brightest was Dean INGE, and his paper on 'Evolution and the Idea of God,' printed in the *Report* of the Congress, is so full of suggestions for preachers that we gladly summarize its points. The Dean begins by warning us not to deify the principle of evolution. The more complex is not necessarily the higher or better. There are blind alleys in Nature. There is such a thing as progress in the direction of evil. The German war-machine was as much a product of evolution as the Church Congress. And if we think that the mere process of time must bring about the Golden Age, the Devil will remind us, 'You forget that I am evolving too.'

The idea of progress is a kind of fetish at which the Dean tilts here as he did in his famous volume of essays. He quotes Rodin, the great sculptor, as saying that 'Progress exists in the world, but not in art. Pheidias will remain for ever without a rival.' The Dean adds that 'Jesus of Nazareth will remain for ever without a rival.' And his argument might be reinforced by Lord Haldane's assertion in his Gifford Lectures that in philosophy we have not gone a step beyond Plato and Aristotle. We must not deify evolution. It is only of finite things within a whole. We cannot infer from the fact of human progress within the historical period that the whole creation is engaged in a similar process. That is contradicted by what we know of astronomy.

That is Dean INGE's first point. His second may be said to be a warning not to let the scientific view of the world dominate us to the exclusion of

other points of view derived from religion, morality, and art, which are equally legitimate. The scientific view is an abstract, and therefore an imperfect, view. This liberation from a scientific obsession is becoming easier, since it has been seen how many of the old presuppositions of science have been challenged. Instead of a dogmatic scientific creed, such as the Victorian Age wished to impose on us, we are confronted with a series of notes of interrogation.

'We thought that lines were straight, and Euclid true ;

God said, "Let Einstein be," and all's askew!'

Then follows a list of the 'uncertainties' of science. What, for example, is evolution? Bergson speaks of 'creative evolution,' Lloyd Morgan of 'emergent evolution,' and Driesch thinks he has established a new vitalism. Pringle Pattison thinks he hasn't, and Needham says that the younger biologists will hear nothing of vitalism in any shape or form. So there is no uniform scientific creed.

This does not mean that all modern science is in the melting-pot, and that we can go back to any traditional story of creation that takes our fancy. No. The chief revelation which God has granted to this generation has been through the natural sciences. And when we muse over the wonderful picture of the universe which they have set before us, three impressions will predominate. First, *Sublimity*. 'What is man that thou art mindful of him?' And yet what is the mind of man that can travel over such immensities! We are abashed and exalted at once. Second, *Order*. 'Thou hast given them a law which cannot be broken.' It is a coherent system. Third, *Purpose*. Surely there is something in what Professor J. A. Thomson says: 'A self-stoking, self-repairing, self-preservative, self-adjusting, self-increasing, self-reproducing machine is only by an abuse of language called a machine at all.'

Does the picture of the Universe which modern science gives us point to materialism, or pantheism, or theism? The Dean can only give us the heads of an argument which is his answer. But here

they are. (1) Evolution is only a process within Nature, a mere variety of change, and there is nothing in its working which can explain how change is possible. Evolution cannot explain itself. (2) Change cannot exist, cannot be thought of, except in relation to the unchanging. This is argued by Kant, and his proof has never been shaken. The idea of evolution implies an unchanging background which is not itself evolving. (3) That which not itself evolving must be a real Being not subject to space or time. And (4) we ourselves would not be conscious of time and change unless we were, in our inmost nature, in contact with the supertemporal and superspatial. Evolution cannot have created our awareness of itself.

If this argument is valid, God can in no sense be a product of evolution, nor can His Being be involved in it. This conclusion brings us into conflict with the school of Hegel, for which the world is as necessary to God as God is to the world. The deity of these philosophers is immanent in the Creation, and has no existence, at any rate for us, outside that relation. But this purely immanent God is not the God of Christianity. Nor can we see how such a Being could survive such a dissolution of His world as science predicts. The hypothesis of a limited God which has appealed to minds as different as John Stuart Mill, Hastings Rashdall, and H. G. Wells may seem to absolve the Deity from complicity in the sin and suffering of the world, but only at the price of introducing an intractable dualism. 'I wish,' says the Dean, 'to emphasize this necessity of setting the object of our worship above the flux of phenomena, just because it runs counter to so much current thought.' The essence of religion is the belief that there is an absolute reality and truth, not within the changing world but above it. 'The Lord sitteth above the water-flood; the Lord remaineth a King for ever.'

There is no real conflict between the assertions of science and those of faith. The belief in Evolution is consistent with the belief in Creation. If science will have nothing to say to unending temporal progress, that does not trouble the Dean, for such a doctrine is not part of Christianity. The

proofs of Divine immanence in no way contradict belief in transcendence. The plain evidence of man's lowly origin is not disturbing, since we all know that every human individual began with microscopic germs much lower in the scale than any mammal. And, finally, if no coherent system can be based on time and space, does this not show that they are not ultimate realities? Even if the very materials of the world dissolve, we know that we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Not only is God above the evolutionary

process; we also have a footing in that eternal world, of which we are citizens.

My conclusion is that Evolution is only the method by which the eternal God carries out most of His purposes in the world. Belief in gradual change is taking the place of the older belief in catastrophic Divine intervention. It is a question about God's method of working. I do not think that the existence or attributes of God are involved in it at all.

The Resurrection of the Body.

BY THE REVEREND J. M. SHAW, D.D., PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

ONE article of our Christian Creed is this: 'I believe in the resurrection of the body.' This is one of the distinctive affirmations of the Christian doctrine of immortality. As against the views at once of Greek philosophy and of Oriental pantheistic thought, Christianity asserts the immortality of the complete personality, not of the spirit only, but of spirit and body.

I.

Here, however, it is necessary to guard very carefully against certain common misrepresentations and misconceptions of the properly Christian New Testament view. The New Testament view with regard to the resurrection of the body is not that the present material body of earth is after death somehow to be revived and resuscitated so as to be united again with the soul or spirit. This was the popular Jewish pre-Christian view, which we find dominant in Jewish Apocalyptic literature and which was held by the Pharisees in our Lord's own day—a view connected originally in Jewish thought with that of the Messianic kingdom as a kingdom to be set up on earth, with the consequent demand that the righteous dead be brought back to life in the body in order to have a share in this Kingdom. It is in this crassly material form, unfortunately, that, chiefly under pressure of the Gnostic controversy, the doctrine of a bodily resurrection first found entrance into the creeds of the Christian Church and has for too long

influenced the Church's thinking on the subject. The earliest Christian Creed, for example, that known as the Old Roman Creed, which is the basis of the later fuller Apostles' Creed, and which Harnack carries back to the early part of the second century, spoke definitely of a 'resurrection of the flesh.' 'I believe in the resurrection of the flesh (*carnis resurrectionem*).' One of these early creeds, the creed of the Church of Aquileia, actually spoke of a 'resurrection of this flesh (*huius carnis resurrectionem*).' The form 'the resurrection of the flesh' still survives in the Church of England Prayer Book in the Order for the visitation of the sick, and in the Offices for infant and adult baptism, though altered to 'the resurrection of the body' in the Daily Services. This materialistic type of view became dominant in the Western Church chiefly through the influence of Augustine, and in process of time found probably its typical or best known expression in the seventeenth-century Westminster credal or confessional formulations. In the Westminster *Shorter Catechism*, for example, in answer to the question, 'What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death?' it is said, 'The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection' (Ans. 37). Here, manifestly, the implication or suggestion is that the body that has gone down into the grave and undergone corruption, will after an indefinite

interval somehow be raised again and reunited with the soul or spirit. As it is put, indeed, explicitly in the Westminster *Confession of Faith*, 'The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption; but their souls, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them . . . waiting for the full redemption of their bodies . . . at the last day (when) the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies, and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls for ever' (chap. xxxii. §§ 1, 2). Between death and resurrection there is, on this view, an intermediate state in which the soul or spirit of the believer exists in a disembodied condition, waiting for reunion with the body which has been laid in the grave, and which is somehow to be resuscitated and then transformed, in order that, soul and body, the Christian may stand complete before the judgment of God in Christ.

II.

Now such a doctrine to us to-day has become scientifically impossible and untenable, and is the ground undoubtedly of much of the opposition of intelligent thinking persons to what they suppose is the Christian Church's view of the resurrection of the body. It is a doctrine, however, which so far from being the properly Christian view, is directly opposed to the New Testament teaching on the subject. It is opposed, in particular, to the teaching of Paul, in whose writings we have the most explicit working out in the New Testament of the Christian view of the resurrection of the body. In his great chapter on the resurrection in 1 Corinthians—chapter 15—he explicitly repudiates and rejects the view in question, characterizing it, indeed, as a 'foolish' view (v.³⁶), as we would say to-day a scientifically impossible and inadmissible conception. It was the kind of view apparently which was at the root of the objection of 'certain individuals' (τινές, v.¹²) in the Greek Corinthian Church, to what they supposed was the Christian teaching as to a bodily resurrection, leading them to take up the position that there can be no such thing as a resurrection of dead persons. What Paul does in this chapter is to endeavour to remove their objection to the Christian doctrine of a bodily resurrection by removing the misconception on which it was based. 'Foolish person' (ἄφρων, v.³⁶), that is how he describes the man who holds the view of a literal or carnal bodily resurrection, a resurrection of the same material fleshy body that has been laid in the

grave and suffered corruption. A body of flesh and blood such as the body of earth is, he says expressly, 'cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, nor can the corruptible inherit the incorruptible' (v.⁵⁰). The future life of the Christian will be indeed an embodied life, he says. The denial or rejection of the crassly material view of popular Jewish thought did not involve for Paul, as it seemed to do for his Corinthian critics, the alternative of the acceptance of the Greek belief in a disembodied or purely spiritual immortality. No, the spirit will have a 'body' or organ of expression and activity in the future life as in this. But, he says, the future resurrection body will be a very different kind of body from the body of earth. For, he points out, there are different kinds of bodies, bodies 'terrestrial' or 'earthly' (σώματα ἐπίγεια) and bodies 'celestial' or 'heavenly' (σώματα ἐπουράνια), bodies fitted for life on earth and bodies fitted for life in heaven (vv.^{39f.}). And by way of illustrating and emphasizing the difference or contrast between the body of the present and the body of the future, Paul takes the analogy of the seed sown in the ground which through dying springs up later to a fuller, larger form of life. What you sow in the spring-time, he says to the Corinthians, is not the body that comes up later; it is 'a mere naked, undeveloped grain' (γυμνὸς κόκκος, v.³⁶)—so naked and undeveloped that you could not tell beforehand, or apart from experience, what kind of body would spring from it. 'But God' (ὁ δὲ Θεός, in contrast to σὺ ὁ σπείρεις in v.³⁶) in the working of His laws in Nature 'gives it a body as He wills' (or 'as He willed' καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, 'the aorist denotes the final act of God's will determining the constitution of Nature'), a body richer and fuller than that which was sown, 'to each kind of seed a body of its own' (ἴδιον σῶμα), a body peculiar to itself, and best fitted to give effective expression in the new conditions to the life or vital principle which possesses it (vv.^{38f.}). 'So,' says Paul, applying the analogy to the connexion between the body of earth and the body of the resurrection 'with the resurrection of the dead' (v.⁴²). As in the resourcefulness of God in Nature (for the secret of all for the Apostle, with his characteristic Hebrew disregard of secondary causes, is the sovereign power of God), the seed sown in the ground springs up in a strikingly different, fuller, and larger form of life, so we may well expect that by the working of His Spirit or the Spirit of the risen Christ in the believer, the redeemed life will become equipped with a body or organism very different from that of earth, a body fitted to the more spiritual conditions of the

future life as the body of earth is to the material conditions of the present. As it has been put in more modern terms: 'If the life-principle in Nature can work such wonders, why hesitate to believe that the life-principle of Spirit, and that too the Divine Spirit, can emerge from the earth into a new and fuller life with a more glorious body' (R. G. Macintyre, *The Other Side of Death*, p. 201).

Who from unsightly bulb or slender root
 Could guess aright
 The story of the flower, the fern, the fruit
 In summer's height?
 Through tremulous shadows voices call to me,
 It doth not yet appear what we shall be.¹

The contrast between the body of the present and the body of the future Paul develops in this chapter in four particulars. First, the body of earth is a body of 'corruption' or 'decay' (*φθορά*), a body of mortality; the resurrection body is a body of 'incorruption' or 'immortality' (*ἀφθαρσία*). Second, the body of earth is a body of 'dishonour' or 'inglory' (*ἀτιμία*); the body of the resurrection is a body of 'glory' (*δόξα*). Third, the

¹ It should be noted that the Apostle does not say that the process of the replacement of the body of earth by the resurrection-body is the same as, or exactly parallel to, the replacement of a grain of wheat or some other grain by a fuller and larger form of life. What he does say is that the two things are so analogous, that if the one takes place so may the other. The process is not the same in the two cases. While in the case of the grain sown the life-principle is buried with it in the earth—the living seed is cast into the earth to die—in the case of the believer the earthly body dies first and then is laid in the earth, not as a seed, but as a corpse. Manifestly, in this case the sowing referred to by Paul must mean, not as is often supposed, the burial of the dead body in the grave, as if the body laid in the grave was the seed out of which the new body is to spring. Rather it must mean the unfolding of the earthly life which precedes death and issues in it. This present life, this life in corruptible flesh and blood, is for Paul the sowing time (cf. Gal 6th); life in the mortal body is the germinal state concluding with death out of which a strikingly different organism will spring. The sowing thus precedes burial, and in death what is corruptible proceeds to dissolution and decay, while what is immortal springs into new life with a body 'peculiar to itself.' It would be better, therefore, to speak not of 'the resurrection of the body' (this suggests too much the old materialistic view that the new body springs from, or out of, the body laid in the grave), but of 'the resurrection-body,' or, as the Nicene formula has it, of 'the resurrection from the dead.'

body of earth is a body of 'weakness' (*ἀσθενεία*); the resurrection-body is a body of 'power' (*δύναμις*). And fourth, and most inclusively, the body of earth is a 'natural' or 'animate' body (*σῶμα ψυχικόν*); the body of resurrection is a 'spiritual' body (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*). It is in the last of these four contrasts, that between a 'natural' body and a 'spiritual' body, that the root or ground cause of the other contrasts is found. 'Corruption,' 'dishonour,' 'weakness,' these are the characteristics of the natural body, the body of flesh and blood. 'Incorruption,' 'glory,' 'power,' these are the characteristics of the spiritual body, the body adapted to the life of the Spirit under the conditions of the future. The natural or animate body we have in relation to Adam, the natural head of the human race, who through the Divine creative inbreathing became a living soul or animate being (*ψυχὴ ζῶσα*)—as we would say to-day, by natural generation; the spiritual body we have in relation to Christ, the last Adam, who through the Resurrection has become a life-creating or life-giving spirit (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν*), the Founder and Head of a new humanity (v.⁴⁵). Not the body of flesh and blood, therefore, is the body which is to be the organ or means of expression of the spirit in the future life—that is subject to corruption and decay, and 'corruption cannot inherit incorruption' (v.⁵⁰). Rather, the body of earth will give place to a body 'like unto' or 'resembling' (*σύμμορφον*, Ph 3²¹), the body of Christ's glory, the spiritual body of the risen, exalted Lord, a fitting organ of life under more spiritual conditions.

In one important respect, indeed, a difference is recognized in the New Testament between the resurrection-body of Christ and the resurrection-body of Christians or believers in Him. In their addresses recorded in the Acts both Peter and Paul call attention to the uniqueness of Christ's experience in this respect, namely, that He, the Holy One or the Beloved One, was not suffered to see corruption (Ac 2³¹ 13^{34f.}). Christ's body of earth, the body which was crucified and buried, saw no corruption; but was quickened, transfigured, and transformed into a spiritual incorruptible body, the mortal element 'absorbed by life,' to use Paul's phrase in 2 Co 5⁴—without any fleshly or sensuous element having to be left behind in the tomb to undergo corruption. This was so in Christ's case, it would seem, not only for evidential purposes, that is to say, for the sake of convincing the disciples of the reality of His resurrection and of the completeness of His triumph over death and the grave; but further, it would seem according to the Apostolic

view, in the very nature of things, it being altogether natural and reasonable that a body unstained by sin, such as that of Jesus was, should not be abandoned to corruption in death. 'Declared to be (or 'marked out to be') the Son of God with power,' says Paul, 'by or according to (κατὰ) the spirit of holiness, when he was raised from the dead' (Ro 1⁴). The resurrection of Jesus was according to the law of the spirit of holiness—as we would say to-day, the physical miracle of the resurrection of Jesus was the natural correlative of the moral uniqueness of His life. In the case of believers, however, what Paul calls 'the redemption of the body' (Ro 8²³) involves the laying aside of the tainted body of earth, leaving it in the grave to the process of dissolution and decay, in order to their being clothed with a body which shall be a fit habitation for and expression of the Spirit, a body whose identity with the body of earth is an identity not of material elements, but of vital, organizing, constructive principle. While thus one great difference is recognized by the apostles between the resurrection-body of Christ and that of believers in Him, yet the ground cause or operative principle of the transformation or transmutation of the natural earthly body into a spiritual resurrection-body is the same in both, namely, the power of the indwelling Spirit or πνεῦμα, the quickening life-giving power of God operating in Christ and then through Him in us—a power which, when its operation is complete, shall transform our bodies into the likeness of the body of Christ's own glory, creating a fitting organ for life under more spiritual conditions.

III.

Now, if this is the Pauline New Testament view of the nature of the resurrection-body, let us notice what seems to be one important implication of it for our conception as to *when* the resurrection of the believer takes place. From the view presented it seems to follow that it is not necessary to hold that after death there is for the Christian any interval during which the soul or spirit is doomed to wait in an intermediate disembodied condition until a distant resurrection-day, when the bodies of all will be raised up and reunited with their souls or spirits. This is the idea of traditional orthodox Protestantism as expressed, for example, in the seventeenth-century Westminster formulations; in particular in the *Shorter Catechism* statement already referred to, namely, that 'the souls of believers are at their death made perfect

in holiness and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection.' Such a view, however, is Jewish rather than Christian. It was, indeed, inherited by Christian theology from pre-Christian Jewish Apocalyptic thought which pictured the soul at death as passing into an intermediate bodiless existence, to be followed at an indefinite interval by a resuscitation and subsequent transfiguration of the body.

The natural implication, however, of Paul's view of the resurrection-body as set forth above is surely that the resurrection, that is to say, the assumption by the spirit of its spiritual resurrection-body, takes place for each believer at death. So that there is no interval between death and entrance on a glorified embodied existence; that indeed, as one writer has put it, 'the [believing] man complete in all that personality requires, stands up alive beyond the great change that we call death, having in the same hour died and risen again' (W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 458). On such a view the interval or intermediate state of disembodied nakedness between death and full glory vanishes; to be absent from the body of earth is in his full complete personality to be present with the Lord.

On this matter, indeed, there seems to have been a development in Paul's thought, which can be traced in his letters. In his earliest extant letter, namely, 1 Thessalonians, written about A.D. 51, where he seems still to be under the influence of the pre-Christian Jewish eschatological conceptions in which, as a Pharisee, he had been brought up, Paul looks forward to a simultaneous general resurrection of the dead in Christ, and speaks of those in the graves being raised up at the Parousia. The Christian dead are spoken of as those who 'sleep in Christ' (οἱ κοιμώμενοι or οἱ κοιμηθέντες, 1 Th 4^{13f.}). Nothing definite, indeed, is said of their condition, but it is implied that they do not get the resurrection-body till Jesus comes again at the Parousia and raises them from the dead. But in his later writings, when he has let the specifically Christian revelation more and more determine his thought, we find he has largely moved away from this point of view. Even in 1 Co 15, indeed, where Paul definitely rejects the Jewish Pharisaic idea of a physical resurrection, he still represents (if v. 23 be taken as genuine), the dead in Christ as being raised up at His Parousia or Second Coming. But in 2 Co 5¹⁻¹⁰ we find him suggesting that at death the believer or Christian becomes 'clothed upon' with the spiritual and

immortal body which God gives, or, as he puts it sometimes, 'which is the gift of the Spirit,' so that there is no interval for the believer between death and the entrance upon a full embodied immortality. Indeed, the most developed Pauline view seems to be that the spiritual body is already being gradually formed here and now, under the influence of the working of the life-creating spirit of Christ, being 'put on over' (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*) the body of earth, as he puts it in 2 Co 5⁴—the mortal body being 'absorbed' by life—and that this spiritual body in the degree of maturity or development to which it has attained at death will then be set free from the entanglements and weaknesses of the body of flesh and blood to serve the Spirit as its fitting organ in a more spiritual form of existence. Through the indwelling of the Spirit in the life of the believer, Paul suggests, there is already going on here in this life a gradual transfiguration or transformation of the whole personality, 'a being transformed into the same likeness as Christ Himself,' passing from one glory to another, as he puts it in 2 Co 3¹⁸—a transformation which, when complete, 'shall transform the body of our humiliation into conformity with the body of Christ's glory' (Ph 3²¹).

It is a view this which, I believe, is in line with and supported by our Lord's own teaching on this subject, as we have indications of it in the Gospels, especially in the Fourth Gospel, where we have the deepest and most spiritual interpretation of Jesus' teaching. In this Gospel, the purpose of Christ is represented most inclusively as 'giving life,' sometimes spoken of as 'eternal life,' life in fellowship with God, a life which already is a present possession, and a life of such a quality that death cannot destroy or end it. This life of the believer in faith-union with Christ is represented as the earnest and guarantee of resurrection, as indeed the very basis and ground of it, so that for those united to Christ by faith, the resurrection-life is already a present experience, which the future will only perfect and complete. When, for example, Martha says of her brother Lazarus, 'I know that he will rise at the resurrection on the last day' (repeating the ordinary Jewish belief at the time), Jesus gently corrects her with the great words which we repeat at Christian burials, but whose significance we have as yet only half appropriated, namely, 'I am myself resurrection and life,' I am life and therefore resurrection, 'No one who lives and believes in me will ever die' (Jn 11²⁵, Moffatt's trans.). As Dr. Marcus Dods has said in his commentary on these words, 'Resurrection and life are not blessings laid up for us in a remote future,

they are present' (*Expositors' Bible*, St. John's Gospel, vol. i. p. 364). It would be cold comfort to Martha, it has been pointed out, that her brother would rise again at the resurrection on the last day, and Jesus tried to withdraw her thoughts from a last-day resurrection and fix them upon the present. Resurrection and life are the portion of the believer now by virtue of his faith-relation or faith-union to Christ; and neither the dissolution of the body of earth nor anything else can stay the full fruition of this possession. This is the characteristically Christian view, the advance made beyond Jewish ideas in the light of the revelation made in Christ and His resurrection, and the pity is that the Christian Church in the formulation of its doctrine on this subject has so largely followed the Jewish pre-Christian position, rather than the distinctively Christian faith of Paul and John.

Such a view of the resurrection-body and its relation to the body of earth, it may be pointed out in closing, presents us at once with a new comfort and a new inspiration.

First, with a new comfort. For such a view, it is evident, if true, removes a certain gloom which still attaches in our traditional Protestant thinking even to the death of the Christian, and which, as expressed in our Protestant Burial Service forms, comes, I believe, with a soul-chilling effect on the mind that is steeped in the New Testament. Our dead in Christ are not living an intermediate, disembodied, shadowlike existence, waiting for the general resurrection. They are already entered on fulness of life in Christ. 'He who possesses the Son possesses life' (1 Jn 5¹²). And this life is not interrupted by death. Death is only a change of embodiment of life; it is the putting off by the spirit of the coarser, more material body of earth in order to the being clothed upon with a more spiritual body, a body which shall be the fitter manifestation and expression of the spirit in the more spiritual conditions of the after life.

And *second*, with a new inspiration. For such a view, it is evident, if true, adds a new moral seriousness and sanction to our living here in the present. To believe that here and now we are creating for ourselves, if we live in the Spirit, the kind of body or organism which will be the instrument of the spirit in the after life—such a thought is calculated, surely, to induce a new respect for life in the body, calling us to present our bodies unto God a living sacrifice that they may become fitter instruments of the Spirit's purposes. 'Know ye not,' says Paul, writing to those Corinthian Christians who

were brought up to think of the body as merely matter, and thus as worthless or evil, 'that you are God's temple, and that God's Spirit dwells within you' (1 Co 3¹⁶). 'Do you not know,' he says again, 'that your body is the temple of the holy Spirit within you . . . then glorify God with your body' (6^{19f.}). The body is meant to be a sacrament of the spiritual. 'Let not sin, therefore, reign over your mortal bodies' (Ro 6¹²). 'He who sows

for his flesh will reap destruction from the flesh, and he who sows for the Spirit will reap eternal life from the Spirit' (Gal 6⁸). No wonder Paul closes his great argument on the resurrection-body in 1 Co 15 with this practical appeal: 'Well then, my beloved brothers, hold your ground, immovable; abound in work for the Lord at all times, for you may be sure that in the Lord your labour is never thrown away' (v.⁵⁸, Moffatt's trans.).

Literature.

THE DECLINE OF THE WEST.

MANY will welcome the appearance of the second volume of the authorized English translation of Oswald Spengler's remarkable work, *The Decline of the West* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). Mr. Charles Francis Atkinson maintains the excellent quality of his translation and provides, as in the first volume, many useful annotations. The complete work, which was first published in 1918, has had an enormous sale in Germany, and around it a whole literature has already gathered.

As explained in our review of the first volume of the translation, the work is a philosophy of history, and its fundamental positions may be thus stated: The great Cultures which have appeared upon the earth fulfil their various epochs and cycles by a certain inward necessity. It is when their history ceases that they become Civilizations. Moreover, they all reveal one universal symbolism, and show among themselves analogous if independent lines of development. As Spengler says in this volume: 'We have to emancipate ourselves from the surfaces of history—and, especially, to thrust aside the artificial fences in which the methodology of Western sciences has paddocked it—before we can see that Pythagoras, Muhammad, and Cromwell embody one and the same movement in three Cultures.' Now *we* have been placed by a Destiny in the Western or 'Faustian' Culture, which arose in West Europe about A.D. 1000. Like the Cultures which have preceded it, it is bound to decline as the life of a tree or a plant declines. Indeed, it bears upon itself already—when compared with the Classical or Græco-Roman Culture in particular—the significant marks of decline; and a proper use of the principle of comparison and analogy should enable us to foresee when the end

of our Western Culture shall come. At the present moment of its development democracy or money-economics is celebrating its last victories, and the Cæsarism that is to succeed approaches with quiet, firm step; but it will be many generations before our Western Culture shall vanish altogether.

It is by no means easy at times to grasp Spengler's meaning, especially when his language is unnecessarily turgid ('the pulse of the cosmic flowings that are occluded in the sequent generations of individual existences'), or his thought couched in his own peculiar terminology ('as the Logos of the John Gospel is a Magian fundamental in Classical shape, so the Basilica is a Magian room whose inner walls correspond to the outer surfaces of the old Classical temple, the cult-building introverted'). But his work has a fascination all its own, and one cannot but be attracted by the concrete and illustrative quality of its style, its amazing erudition, and the boldness and insistency of its generalizations. It should be observed, however, that Spengler is regarded in many quarters as not infallible as to his facts—to say nothing of his judgments; nor is this surprising, so numerous, and so intimate often, are his references to the various domains of history, and politics, religion and philosophy, science, art, and literature.

There is much in this second volume of special interest to the student of Christian origins and Christian history. Its initial discussions are of cities and peoples, and its concluding discussions of the State, but the central portion of the volume deals with Problems of the Arabian or 'Magian' Culture, within which Christianity originated and attained a certain development. Here are some extracts illustrative of Spengler's views on Christianity which are nothing if not up to date. 'The incomparable thing which lifted the infant

Christianity out above all religions in this rich Springtime is the figure of Jesus. Tame and empty all the legends and holy adventures of Mithras, Attis, and Osiris must have seemed to any man reading or listening to the still recent story of Jesus' sufferings. Christianity is the one religion in all the history of the world in which the fate of a man of the immediate present has become the emblem and the central point of the whole creation.' 'One historical figure of Mandæanism stands forth with startling distinctness, as tragic in his purpose and his downfall as Jesus Himself—John the Baptist. To him came Jesus and was his disciple. Thenceforth the apocalyptic, and in particular the Mandæan, thought-world filled his whole being.' 'Paul was a rabbi in intellect and an apocalyptic in feeling. And thus there came to be two Magian religions with the same Scriptures (namely, the Old Testament), but a double Halakha, the one setting toward the Talmud, and the other in the direction of the Gospel.' 'It is not the words of Jesus, but the doctrine of Jesus in the Pauline form, that constitutes the substance of Mark.'

With Luther, Spengler deals faithfully: 'What Luther lacked—and it is an eternal fatality for Germany—was the eye for facts and the power of practical organization. He did not bring his doctrines to a clear system, nor did he lead the great movement and choose its aim. The one and the other were the work of his great successor, Calvin. While the Lutheran movement advanced leaderless in Central Europe, he viewed his rule at Geneva as the starting-point of a systematic subjection of the world under a Protestantism unfalteringly thought out to its logical conclusion. Therefore he, and he alone, became a world-power.'

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

Sir George Adam Smith has speedily followed his revision of Isaiah by a new and revised edition of *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2 vols., 10s. 6d. net each). The task was a formidable and even a stupendous one. In the thirty-two years that have elapsed since the publication of the first volume of the original edition, criticism has made great strides and raised new problems of text, metre, and—in books like Hosea, Habakkuk, and Haggai, to mention no others—of interpretation. The range and amount of the critical work that has appeared in the intervening period may be roughly measured by the elaborate bibliographies which the Principal has appended, and to which he could easily have added,

had it been his aim to be exhaustive; and the enormous amount of matter to be assimilated may be roughly measured by the simple circumstance that one single item—that of Bulmerincq on Malachi—represents a book of five hundred and twelve closely printed pages in German, which are probably not yet familiar even to the majority of English-speaking scholars.

A careful comparison of the two editions reveals the thorough and conscientious quality of the revision: at numerous points there are subtle changes and modifications, and whole paragraphs are rewritten or expanded in the light of recent discussion. The section, for example, dealing with Hosea's relation to Gomer reckons with the views of Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago, L. Waterman, and H. Schmidt, expressed within the last few years in magazine articles. Textual emendations receive even more consideration than one is entitled to expect in a book whose primary aim is expository, and the Principal makes his own contribution to the criticism of the text: Marti, for example, approves his suggestion, based on the LXX, of מרדכי in Mal 1⁴. But, thorough as this work is, Sir George's deepest interest is in the interpretation and exposition of the prophetic messages themselves. Highly characteristic are the words with which he closes his introductory discussion of Hosea: 'We have now our material before us and may proceed to the more welcome task of tracing our prophet's life, and expounding his teaching.' This expository task he proceeds to execute, even where the material is not very promising, in his own inimitable way.

In the expository, as distinguished from the critical, part of these volumes the revised edition differs but little from the original. This is as it should be. The earlier exposition was already as perfect as that rare and perhaps unexampled combination of insight, imagination, eloquence, and scholarship could well make it. To most preachers the Minor Prophets were an unknown land till Principal Smith explored and described it for them, and the revision will, we are sure, continue to instruct and inspire the preachers of the next thirty years as the original edition has kindled the minds and hearts of the preachers of the last thirty.

BUDDHISM.

Of books on Buddhism there is no end. But here is one that ought not to be crowded out, *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism*, by Professor James Bissett Pratt, Ph.D. (Macmillan; 15s. net). It is

a big work of seven hundred and fifty pages ; and a full one, packed with information, knowledge, apt quotation ; and with a very wide sweep indeed. Does it not start with Gotama, and pass from land to land, and age to age, and sect to sect, following the bewildering history of that protean faith ? But, above all, the book is marked, not only by first-hand knowledge, but by what does not always accompany that, both sympathy and sanity—those indispensable requirements if one is to understand, and, so understanding, not to be swept off one's feet, not to lose balance and sense of proportion and perspective.

It is a wonderful story, and it is well told. Is there anything more striking in human thought than the fact that this faith which seemed to have small room for God has in some of its sects become a loving bhakti of a Trinity ; that this flinging of the whole burden on one's own efforts has had to find a place for grace unsought and eagerly offered ; that the august ideal of the soul, as we would say, bent on its own emancipation, losing all for that, and working for it with a passionate moral earnestness, has given place in these sects to one more moving still, whereby the soul, as we would say, refuses to accept its own reward, asks only to be sent back—life on life—into this needy earth, to give and toil and die for others until there is no creature left unsaved ! Read Dr. Pratt, and he will lead you through the deeps of philosophy, and sometimes through aridities that seem waterless enough, though even there he holds one's interest. But the end of the Pilgrimage—with some sects—is something that that great missionary Dr. Timothy Richard called 'Just Pre-Nestorian Christianity,' due, he believed, to Christian influence, or at least to a cry of the heart quite strikingly familiar for what we know and have in Jesus Christ.

THE BIRTH OF JUDAISM.

In *The Birth of Judaism* (Luzac ; 5s. net), Dr. John A. Maynard has many interesting and some startling suggestions to offer. The book is a useful *Study of Hebrew Religion during the Exile*, as the sub-title suggests, and it deals briefly but freshly with the political, ethical, and religious interests involved. The topics treated are the Names, Majesty, Spirit, Omnipresence and Omniscience of God, Communion with God, The Problem of Suffering, Organized Holiness, Worship and Expiation, Sacred Festivals and Fasts, Food Restrictions, Evil Spirits, Magic—these and many others. The complexity of the religious problem created by the

Exile is forced upon us, and we are made to feel it all the more that Dr. Maynard rests his discussion in part on a critical basis which would not be accepted by the majority of Old Testament scholars. P, for example, is pre-exilic, and comes before D, which is exilic : Deutero-Isaiah does not write in Babylon, he is a Palestinian Jew. Sometimes he is needlessly provocative, as when he tells us that 'it is evident that Amos was not a theologian,' or that 'if the Lord had told Isaiah that a child would be born who would crush the Assyrian between his tiny hands, as one greater than Hercules, he would have believed it.' It is also rather astonishing to find him quote Ps 49⁷ as 'no man can redeem a brother from death,' when the emended text, 'surely no man can redeem himself' (which the context demands), is almost universally accepted. It is also disconcerting to find Browning's famous lines quoted thus, 'Never doubted that the clouds would break. . . . Held we fall to rise, and baffled to fight better.' Indeed, these are but samples of slips which do not altogether strengthen one's confidence in the discussion, and are illustrated by a bewildering series of irritating misprints, like the following : p. 7, pover (for *w*) ; p. 9, Nehemish ; p. 13, unknow (for unknown) ; p. 23, King of the Samaria ; p. 24, independance ; Sulzgerger (for *b*) ; p. 25, sith (for *w*) ; p. 38, wiich ; p. 39, wirth (for with) ; p. 49, in Jewish history (*in* omitted) ; p. 55, beans (for *m*) ; p. 59, ezra (for *E*) ; p. 60, one of the aspects (*of* omitted) ; p. 64, Te (for The) ; p. 68, Salomon ; p. 75, fort (for for) ; p. 78, 'almah (for 'almah) ; p. 92, transcendalism ; p. 112, In hate (for I hate) ; p. 118, etheical ; p. 120, has (for hast) ; p. 123, Thorah. The punctuation is sometimes equally provoking : for example, 'The court prophets, were loyalists' (p. 23) ; or take this amazing sentence, 'As a child, or as a lad, Judaism, had a wonderful ideal' (p. 141). Really an Oriental scholar might reasonably be expected to write better English than that. And where in the Book of Isaiah are we to look for 'Is 41, 27029' ? This leaves even Ps 119 immeasurably behind. It is a pity that so many avoidable and unpardonable errors should disfigure a book which really has something to say and drops not a few fruitful suggestions by the way, as that 'it has often been said but never proved that Mazdeism influenced the growth of angelology in Israel.'

RELIGIOUS PSYCHOLOGY.

An exceedingly interesting and useful book on this subject, or one branch of it, has recently been

written by the Rev. A. R. Uren, Ph.D., *Recent Religious Psychology: A Study in the Psychology of Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d. net). Strictly speaking, it is a critical exposition of the methods and results of representative investigators of the psychological phenomena of religion. But there is a valuable chapter at the close in which the writer gives us his own conclusions. The writers chosen for exposition are Starbuck, Coe, William James, Pratt, Ames, Stratton, and Leuba. We are given a full account of the views expressed by each of these authorities in his most important work, and in each case the exposition is followed by a critical estimate. These chapters are well done. And those who are not able to read the originals will gain here an intelligent apprehension of the contribution which these distinguished men have made to the subject.

The most interesting and important part of the book, however, is Part III., in which Dr. Uren sums up. He has not a very favourable view of the result of all the psychologizing that has been done. The most that can be claimed is that the field has been surveyed and some loose generalizations made that are more or less suspect. Outside the field of exceptional and bizarre religious phenomena the harvest has been meagre. Further, the author gives additional emphasis to the familiar criticism that psychologists frequently trespass on a province which does not belong to them. They suggest that because psychology cannot prove the truth of religion, belief in the supernatural is a delusion. Having explained religious phenomena in terms of law the psychologist often assumes that he has explained it away. This 'colossal *petitio principii*' is subjected to severe and annihilating criticism by Dr. Uren. He points out that many psychologists know nothing of religion from the inside, and that their judgment on it is as valid as that of a man who passes an opinion on a cathedral window from the outside of the building.

This is a satisfactory type of book. It combines clear exposition with a criticism which is well founded and enlightening. It will afford to the uninitiated and the inquiring a very good introduction to its subject.

THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL.

Last year a really notable gathering assembled in Jerusalem. If ever a conference could effect something this was surely it. The subject was so vital—*The Christian Life and Message in Relation*

to Non-Christian Systems of Hope and Thought (Milford; 5s. net). The personnel was so impressive. For this was the International Missionary Council, and it was drawn together from a wide and catholic field. Not the least valuable contributions, for example, came from the representatives of the new Eastern Churches—surely the happiest of omens. The preliminary work was admirable. Witness, as a case in point, the remarkable synopsis of opinions on Confucianism (here printed) as impressive as it is informing. The papers were read by picked men—Dr. Macnicol on Hinduism, Dr. Leighton Stuart and Dr. Willard Lyon on Confucianism, Professor Saunders and Professor Reischauer on Buddhism, the late Canon Gairdner on Islam, Professor Rufus Jones on Secularism, regarded as the real rival of the faith to-day—and in every case they were worthy, while some of them—like Dr. Macnicol's on Christianity and Hinduism—were statesmanlike and masterly. The one cited appears to have been criticised by some for dwelling in the main on the higher aspects of the Indian faith—overmuch these critics felt. The discussion was in the hands of experts, and, as reported here, was full and varied. There were additional papers called for in light of the trend of opinion that disclosed itself, and there is a summing up—'the statement of the Council'—all of which is here given. And yet, while it was intended that each of the sectional meetings should present findings to the full Council, only two of them, those dealing with Buddhism and with Islam, did so. The findings, achieved through so much labour, seem obvious to any one who has given thought to such matters at all. In spite of the fineness of its spirit and the beauty of its thought and language, the same applies to the Council's statement. It is a noble document. But it simply restates the axioms that cry aloud of themselves in every intelligent Christian's mind. Yet the Conference was not in vain. Those who participated at Jerusalem no doubt went each his several way with a thrilled sense of the bigness of Christ's Church, and of the wonder of the Master. And something of that they make shift to share with others. This is the first of eight volumes, and in it are published the addresses, the discussions, and the like. They make a full and fascinating book worth studying.

THE MONKS OF KÛBLÂI KHÂN.

Readers interested in the history of the Nestorian Church in Asia will find delight in *The Monks of*

Kāblāi Khān, Emperor of China (R.T.S.; 12s. 6d. net), by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, M.A., Litt.D., who is so well known for his works on Egyptian and Babylonian research. In a volume of over three hundred pages, beautifully illustrated both in the text and with numerous plates, Sir Wallis gives the fascinating history of the life and travels of Rabban Sawma, an envoy and plenipotentiary of the Mongol Khans to the kings of Europe, together with the story of Marcos, who became patriarch of the Nestorian Church in Asia. The two Chinese monks set out to go to Jerusalem to pray at the tomb of Jesus, where they hoped to gain the remission of their sins and to obtain peace in their souls. They never reached Jerusalem, and the history relates what became of them. Sir Wallis has carefully translated the whole from a Syriac document. There is a mass of information not only about Nestorianism, but about the Il-Khans of Persia and their dealings with the Mongol Christians, which is found nowhere else. In a scholarly introduction (118 pages) he discusses the heresy of Nestorius, the conversion of Turkestan, the downfall of the Nestorian Church in China, the travels of the Chinese monks, the relation of the Mongols to Christianity, and other interesting chapters in Oriental history. The book contains an excellent bibliography of over sixty works on the subject, a complete index, and a list of the Scripture passages quoted. All interested in Church history, and especially in the doctrine of the Person of Christ, will welcome the translation of this remarkable Syriac text, and the collection of so many essential facts, both historical and archæological, in the introduction.

A GALLANT RELIGION.

Every reader of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES knows how well Professor Gossip can speak to children: his recent volume *The Hero in thy Soul* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net), like the two in the same series which preceded it, reveals the same mastery in the art of commending Christian truth to mature men and women. The particular truth insisted on throughout most of the volume is the duty of a heroic attitude to life. It is indeed a gallant book on Christian gallantry by a gallant soul. No words occur in it so often as 'gallant' and 'whimper': on 'whimpering' Professor Gossip has no mercy, while 'gallantry of action' is to him one of the most precious fruits of the truly Christian temper. Christ Himself was 'the gallantest of hearts,' 'the gallantest figure in human history.'

All authentic religious literature, he tells us, is autobiographical. This book, with its simple spontaneity which never aims at literary effect, is assuredly authentic religious literature, and just as assuredly is it autobiographical, as is obvious not only in its warm and frequent references to children and in its many telling allusions to the writer's experience at the Front, but on every page it is evident that he is speaking out of the depths of a rich experience of life and of Christ, and of the power of Christ to keep men calm and high-hearted amid life's conflicts and sorrows. His deft, yet always unobtrusive, allusions to literature reveal the catholicity of his sympathy and the breadth of his culture: Anatole France and Samuel Rutherford, Bernard Shaw and Richard Baxter, Confucius and Tagore, Goethe and Bourget, Chaucer and Epictetus, and a score of others—what a motley crowd they are! But Professor Gossip knows how to bend them all to his service, and he possesses in abundant measure the gift of imagination, without which preaching can never touch the highest levels. Nor is he afraid of unconventional words: sometimes he gets home to the heart by the use of the Doric, as in 'daft' and 'trachled,' and sometimes by words of his own coinage, like 'unfidgety,' 'hominess,' 'hot-housey.'

The sermons, while not in the strict sense expository, have a way of piercing to the heart of the text, and of the experience it expresses; and we should not wonder if the vivid words on the conduct of Edom on pp. 172 f. will send many a preacher back to the much neglected book of Obadiah. In this volume the preacher will find stimulus everywhere, not only in Professor Gossip's exposition of his texts—that is inimitable—but in numberless incidental touches, of which here is one—a quotation from Croce—from a striking sermon dealing with the passing and the permanent. 'It is not only with souls that are dear to us, but with institutions that we love, that we must be prepared to say, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."' One of the sermons was preached on Easter Day. It appears—in shortened form—in 'The Christian Year.'

THE SUMERIANS.

The time was when all the arts were traced to Greece. Later it was found that they drew their genius from older nations, such as the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Cretans, and others. Now research

is showing that the roots go still farther back and that behind all these lies Sumer or ancient Babylonia. In *The Sumerians* (Clarendon Press ; 6s. net), Mr. C. Leonard Woolley, whose discoveries at Ur during recent years have aroused such widespread interest, has written a graphic account of the Sumerian civilization for the non-specialist reader, and gives many reasons for this ancient civilization being regarded as the forerunner of all those in the Old World, not excepting that of Egypt. The interest of the volume to the Biblical scholar lies in the fact that the Sumerians contributed a large stock of ideas to the Hebrew people. The Sumerian stories of the Creation and the Flood were adopted ready-made by the latter ; the laws of Moses were largely based on Sumerian codes which Hammurabi had utilized in the making of his own ; and during the period of the Kings and the Captivity the Jewish religion owed much to the Babylonian worship which had been taken over from Sumer. It is evident, therefore, as Mr. Woolley endeavours to show, that one of the first causes lighting up the Hebrew world lies in this advanced civilization of six thousand years ago. The chapter on Sumerian society is particularly interesting. The laws affecting mistresses and slaves are illustrated in the domestic position of Sarah and Hagar, for in every detail Abraham seems to have been putting in practice the old Sumerian law in which he had been brought up. Mr. Woolley points out, too, that it was the custom that, even though silver and gold could be handled in recognizable form such as ingots and rings, the value of these had to be verified by scales ; and hence it was that, when Abraham bought the cave at Macpelah, he 'weighed . . . four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant' (Gn 23¹⁶). A few generations ago the existence of the Sumerians was unknown. It is largely due to Mr. Woolley and other excavators that their history can now be written and illustrated so fully, to the great advantage of the Bible. It deserves to be said that the book is beautifully printed, and has a map and twenty-nine illustrations.

BRINGING UP THE CHILD.

Parents, nurses, and those who have to do with the training of children certainly need wise guidance, and this is offered from many quarters, by theorists and practical persons, and not seldom to-day by psychological experts. A bulky volume, *Difficulties in Child Development*, by Mary Chad-

wick, S.R.N., F.B.C.N. (Allen & Unwin ; 15s. net), is the latest effort of this kind. The fact that the author is a member of the College of Nursing, of the British Psychological Society, and an associate member of the International Psycho-Analytical Society, will inspire confidence in many breasts as securing both theory and practice in the adviser. But it will give also a gentle hint to discerning persons as to where the author stands. And this hint is soon confirmed—in the preface, where we are prepared to find Freud the inspiring guide, and later by the contents of the book itself. Miss (or Mrs.?) Chadwick is an ardent disciple of Freud, and we find traces of his influence everywhere. Indeed, the book is an example of the kind of thing that is going to happen when Freud invades our homes and welfare centres.

There are many statements in the book which would be challenged by common sense. A very simple instance is the following : 'Our next step is to inquire why childhood should be an unhappy time, if we agree that this may be inferred from the fact that it is so generally forgotten.' Most of us would say that the fact that it is forgotten is a proof that it was happy, for it is the unpleasant things in our childhood, and these almost alone, that we remember. This is an innocent example of the kind of theorizing that often goes astray. The Freudian determinism leads the writer in many cases to exaggerated interpretations of phenomena of childhood, as, for example, that a too early weaning of a baby makes him a pessimist in later years !

At the same time there is a great deal of sound investigation behind these pages, and in many places a good deal of sense. There are chapters on the Development of the Senses, the Dangers of Suggestion, the Dawn of Personality and its Growth, Children's Games, and other aspects of child life. The author has read much, and seen much, but her thoughtful book is deprived of a good deal of its possible value by the obsession that penetrates it.

Since the publication of 'The Life and Letters of Octavia Hill,' the notable social worker and reformer, her younger sister, Mrs. Emily Southwood Maurice, has come into possession of a large number of her letters written to Mary Harris, a member of the Society of Friends. They include unpublished letters of John Ruskin, under whose

training Octavia Hill worked for ten years, together with letters of her own describing her experiences and conversations with that great master. These are now published under the title *Octavia Hill: Early Ideals* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). The remarkable letters of the girl of sixteen are a revelation of the enthusiastic but intensely practical and sagacious social reformer of mature years. One finds this sentence in one of the earliest: 'Oh, what a power for good any one has, who does go among people, as if he was one of them, entering into all their thoughts.' It is impossible to turn a page of this volume without coming across something suggestive of an extraordinary personality and of a mind filled with the ideal, that the purpose and reward of life are in doing good. One of her young pupils says: 'I am sure she thought nothing was too unimportant to be done well, if done at all. Her teaching was inspiring.' One of her heroes was the Rev. F. D. Maurice, who writes to her: 'On the whole the greatest comfort I can find, though I have learnt the art most imperfectly, is in St. Paul's words, that we may put off the old man every day and put on the new. That is to say, not a new man that we have worked out for ourselves from the material of our own selfishness, but the true Man, the Son of Man, in whom is no selfishness, who is Head of us all, who leads us to His Father and our Father.' The simple trust in Him one comes back to as the deepest and most practical wisdom, and the sure, distinct words which express it as more comprehensive, as well as more appropriate to our personal difficulties than all others.'

It is impossible to withhold admiration of the extraordinary amount of careful and laborious research which must have preceded the writing of *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press, 1819-1832*, by Mr. William H. Wickwar, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net), and the preparation of the elaborate footnotes of the authorities consulted with which it is accompanied. This intense and extraordinary struggle was waged not so much for the freedom of the newspaper press, a very limited organization in the first quarter of last century, but on behalf of books and pamphlets, handbill and poster. What a contemptible part, as it seems to-day, was played in this prolonged and relentless warfare by leading statesmen and especially by leading lawyers who were law-officers of the Crown, and by eminent judges! In our own day, just a century after the conflict for freedom had been won, the intervention of Parliament has been

necessary to restrict the liberty of the newspaper press in the publication of the details of cases in the Divorce Courts because of its abuse.

An apologetic of an unusual, but always welcome, kind may be found in *The Quest Eternal*, by E. A. Wanderer (the Rev. W. A. Elliott), published by Messrs. Allenson (5s. net). The sub-title is 'How I wandered in the Wilderness of Life and How I found Religion.' In other words, it is a spiritual autobiography. The author was challenged by a friend who was without any belief to say how he came to be a believer, and the result was this story of his soul's progress from darkness to light. The book was well worth writing, for it blazes a clear path to a positive faith, by way of experience, through the jungles of doubt. Most of the difficulties that beset youth are frankly faced, and the religion that is set before us as the final achievement is a broad-minded and defensible creed with Christ as its centre. If any one is looking for a book that will help a youth in difficulties about his religious faith, here is what he wants.

Mr. C. G. Challenger, M.A., has published the Hulsean Prize Essay for 1927. The title is *The Excellence of Revealed Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net). The book is well summarized as an attempt to trace the growth and decay of the religious outlook which regards Christianity as a revealed religion, the truth and excellence of which are capable of being demonstrated by proofs such as prophecies and miracles, to criticise this view, and to contrast with it the modern conception of revelation. While we approve of the essayist's standpoint, and congratulate him on the lucidity of his exposition (except in his references to mysticism) and the carefulness of his statements (except, perhaps, in the case of the doctrine of John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist), we found ourselves wondering as we read his pages what the Rev. John Hulse (a contemporary of William Paley) would have thought of them!

Mr. Challenger has consulted widely among recent books on his subject, and quotes freely in the critical and positive part of his Essay from such writers as von Hügel, Professor J. S. Huxley, Dean Inge, and Rudolf Otto. Chiefly under the guidance of the last-named, as it would appear, he presses towards his conclusion that revelation is the apprehension by specially endowed men of the Divine Reality behind appearances. Not altogether worthy of the rest of the Essay is the apologetic addendum, in which it is virtually affirmed that

to have insisted on the objectivity of religious experience is to have 'established' the truth of revealed religion.

We had thought that the 'Christ-Myth' hypothesis was exploded a score of years ago, but here it is again in Mr. R. H. Crompton's *The Synoptic Problem and a New Solution* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net). The author appears to combine radical scepticism as to the historical existence of Jesus, and, by consequence, as to the trustworthiness of the Gospels, with a sincere loyalty to the 'Christ-Idea'; which cannot be said of all who have hitherto stood for the thoroughgoing mythical interpretation of the Gospels.

His theory of a 'Pre-Synoptic Gospel' embedded in Luke, and originating in Alexandria in the dawn of Christianity, is his solution of the Synoptic Problem. Despite the pains he has taken in the exposition of the theory, he has not succeeded in making it leap to the eye of the reader; and it would be difficult to present it here in brief compass. We must be content to say that his 'Proto-Luke' was originally, as the Pre-Synoptic Gospel, a mystery consisting of a sevenfold parallelism of symbols and ideas, and that it was turned into a history of the Early Church by the Alexandrian section, being adapted by them to their own ends in their controversy with the Palestinian section. For example, the younger son in the Parable is an Alexandrian, the citizen of the far country a Jew, and the elder son a Judaizer. And we had thought that this kind of parabolic interpretation had been abandoned twoscore years ago!

Mr. Crompton makes a point against Canon Streeter's 'The Four Gospels' when he says that with each added source for the Gospels the probability of the theory is diminished in an almost geometrical progression. He will not take it amiss if we make a similar point against his theory and ask to be allowed to judge it by its results.

One of the most interesting and valuable volumes in 'The Living Church' Series, edited by Professor J. E. McFadyen, is *The Church and the Hymn Writers*, by the Rev. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net). Mr. Martin's aim is to deal with the various periods of hymn production as illustrating the doctrinal development of the Christian Church. Happily he does not always keep to his text, and as a result we have a fascinating study of hymnology throughout the centuries. And in the course of this survey many interesting facts are disclosed and some interesting problems

are discussed. Should hymns be altered, for example? A well-known instance is Dr. John Hunter's alteration of 'Rock of Ages.' Is that justifiable? Dr. Martineau points out that all adapters of the psalms in a Christian direction have put into David's mouth sentiments he could not have uttered. And he defends the practice of altering hymns on the ground that this is simply to translate the religious dialect of one age into that of another. Readers will find both sides of the question stated in Mr. Martin's pages.

There are four purposes which hymns serve—for public worship, for solos, for private devotion, and to illustrate the growth of Christian doctrine. The author discusses these, and he has many practical suggestions for the use of hymns both in public and private. But his book is chiefly of value for the light it throws on the development of belief. And as the reader follows his guide through the centuries he will find himself more and more absorbed in the interest of the tale.

A Faith for the World, by Mr. William Paton (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a book which owes its birth to the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council. Its purpose is 'to set out the main elements of the case for the Christian world mission, and to show some of the principal tasks which are bound up with that mission.' It is a thoroughly well-informed and impressive survey of the world situation from the viewpoint of religion, and it presses home with weight and urgency the duty of the Christian Church to meet the situation by a more enlightened and vigorous evangelism. Preachers will find here a considerable amount of excellent material for missionary sermons.

The Rev. U. Z. Rule offers in *Baptism, Confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist* (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d. net) a useful little manual designed for the use of Anglicans, but which might well appeal to evangelical Protestants without the fold of Anglicanism. Ministers would find it particularly useful in the preparation of catechumens. Yet it should be explained that the author's primary aim is not pædagogical but irenic. It is his hope that by his exposition of the Christian sacraments he may help to remove differences and to further the cause of Christian unity. On the other hand, he will have no traffic with Transubstantiation and the literalist interpretation of the words of the institution of the Eucharist. A feature of the book is the

patristic learning it shows and its many instructive quotations from the Fathers.

The Rev. R. Pyke, President of the United Methodist Church for the year 1927-28, has published a selection of the sermons and addresses delivered by him during his year of office, under the title *Sundry Times* (Henry Hooks; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Pyke has no need to be apologetic in thus challenging criticism. These sermons and addresses are the best proofs that he is sure of himself and of the potency of his message. The text of the first sermon in the little volume is from the words of Job, 'I know that my redeemer liveth.' He is a preacher and pastor of long experience, a pronounced evangelical, evidently a man of wide reading, with an intimate knowledge of human nature, more particularly, of course, of Methodist human nature, a touch of irony in his sense of humour, but with all a fervid faith in the gospel he preaches with steadfast courage.

Christianity and the Religious Drama, by Mr. R. H. U. Bloor, B.A. (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net), is the Essex Hall Lecture for 1928. It gives a brief but interesting sketch of the development of the mediæval mystery play and indicates its influence on Elizabethan drama. The writer laments the breach in the tradition made by Puritanism, and desiderates a return to the modern theatre of a drama that is religious.

The Tercentenary of Bunyan's birth has called forth a considerable number of readable accounts of the life of the great dreamer. The latest addition to the number, *John Bunyan in Relation to his Times*, by the Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), fills a niche all its own. The writer has succeeded in giving a very clear and succinct account of religious parties and controversies in the England of the seventeenth century. He thus enables us to see Bunyan in the framework of his times and in the company of his contemporaries. He is brought on the stage along with Baxter and Fox, Milton and Cromwell, and needless to say he can stand comparison with the best of them.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr has a poor opinion of many things, but, above all, religion, as he sees it, is in a shockingly bad way. For it is in the awkward fix that it is called upon to fight on two separate fronts at the same time against attacks being pressed home with vigour both on its metaphysics and its ethics. So situated, it has chosen to fling its main

energy into beating back the former danger—a natural choice, thinks Dr. Niebuhr, but an unwise one. For 'more men in our modern era are irreligious because religion has failed to make civilization ethical, than because it has failed to maintain its intellectual respectability.' In that view he has a striking mass of support these days. It is impressive to note how many feel the danger-point lies there. Is there not some talk in the air of swinging round the theological curriculum to face, no longer intellectual doubt so much, as the assault on Christian ethics. This book—*Does Civilization Need Religion?* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net)—is an attempt to rouse the Church to recapture and hold this Hougomont that is the key to the whole battle. It is a vigorous bit of work, in which the author lays about him with a sturdy truculent assurance, in many telling phrases all delivered very rapidly, in a loud, carrying, somewhat metallic voice that grows a little tiring. We walk a long way with immense energy, and see many interesting things. But the fact is, Dr. Niebuhr talks about religion with a curious aloofness. Those who read him had better follow on by glancing again at Harnack's 'Social Gospel,' or even Eucken's 'Present Day Ethics,' and so get back to the centre of things.

'The missionary among Moslems (to whom the Cross of Christ is a stumbling-block and the atonement foolishness) is driven daily to deeper meditation on this mystery of redemption and to a stronger conviction that here is the very heart of our message and our mission.' Mr. S. M. Zwemer, a missionary in Cairo, has given us in *The Glory of the Cross* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net) a series of meditations on the Passion and Death of our Lord. They are at once scholarly and devout, and abound in apt illustrations drawn from Christian art and literature. The Passion scenes are conceived with vividness and the cumulative effect is deeply moving.

Christian scholars are sometimes accused, not unjustly, of their ignorance of Rabbinic Literature. Considering the range, complexity, and difficulty of that literature, this is perhaps a venial offence. So far, however, as the first century is concerned, President A. Büchler, Ph.D., has come to their rescue with an enlightening book which comprises five very elaborate *Studies in Sin and Atonement* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). They deal successively with (1) Obedience to the Torah, its Source and Sanction; (2) The Service of God for the Love or the Fear of Him and the Right Attitude to Suffer-

ing; (3) The Defiling Source of Sin in the Bible; (4) The Defiling Source of Sin in Post-Biblical and Rabbinical Literature; and (5) Atonement of Sin by Sacrifice.

Probably the discussion which will most appeal to Christian readers is the second, on the right attitude to suffering. R. Akiba, it appears, distinguished four attitudes to suffering, the highest being that of David who prayed for more chastisements as purifying him from sins, the second that of Abraham's silent submission to the Divine command to sacrifice his son, the third that of Hezekiah who prayed for the removal of his sickness and referred to his merits, while the lowest is that of Job who 'kicked against his afflictions.' Typically curious and interesting is the Rabbinic debate on whether Job acted from the love or from the fear of God. In the light of modern criticism much of the Rabbinic chronology seems very futile and grotesque, as when, for example, Job is regarded as living before the Pharaoh of the Exodus, or as one of his servants, or when Elihu is identified with Isaac or Balaam. At other points, however—and they are many—we come upon more solid and fruitful things: for example, 'The love of God as the motive of serving Him is evinced in man's readiness to obey God in all circumstances, even to death, in his practice of His commandments without expecting a reward, and in his refraining without the fear of punishment from transgressing a prohibition, in his practical love of his fellow-man and in his right attitude to God in suffering.' An index would have enhanced the value of this learned book.

The ingenuous confessions interspersed throughout Mr. W. A. Wordsworth's *Sawn Asunder* (Moring; 3s. 6d. net) scarcely enhance our confidence in his argument. The book is written in defence of the unity of the Book of Isaiah; the writer even believes that the prophecies were arranged by Isaiah himself in exact chronological order; and the 'one really creative idea' which he claims for his book is the identification of Immanuel with the Servant. That is a hard saying, and it is not made any the more credible by the author's modest but reiterated assurances that he knows little Hebrew and nothing of Hebrew metre, though this does not deter him from offering both textual and metrical suggestions. He believes that the difference in style between the two great sections of Isaiah is adequately accounted for by the change of subject. Immanuel, he suggests, was one of those carried away captive by Sennacherib.

The book, however, is by no means negligible. It puts the case for the unity of Isaiah perhaps as strongly as it can be put, and some of Mr. Wordsworth's suggestions are certainly worth considering. In particular it is not a little interesting to find him independently reaching the conclusion recently reached by a scholar of very different calibre, Professor Torrey in his 'Second Isaiah,' namely, that the references to Cyrus are later interpolations whose removal is demanded alike by context and metre. A conclusion reached along two such different roads deserves, and will doubtless receive, the earnest consideration of scholars.

The Report of the Church Congress held at Cheltenham in 1928 has been published under the title *The Anglican Communion, Past, Present and Future*, edited by the Rev. Canon H. A. Wilson (Murray; 7s. 6d. net). It makes extraordinarily interesting reading. What else could it be with essays in it by Canon Streeter on Modernism, Canon Quick on Anglican Belief, Dean Inge on Evolution and the Idea of God, Dr. N. P. Williams on the Atonement, Canon Rawlinson on the Bible, and Professor W. R. Matthews on Modern Philosophy? The Anglican Church is happy in possessing at present so many of the leading thinkers of our time. All those named above are men to whom multitudes look for guidance, and they are only a few of the distinguished company housed in this volume.

The Congress of 1928 was notable for two things. It was determined to face the facts, and therefore men of different schools were invited to state their views frankly. Both Dr. H. D. A. Major and Dr. N. P. Williams were therefore included, and these represent very different schools. The comforting result was that a large area of common belief was found to exist. And another result is that a great deal was said by these eminent men of differing camps to sustain and reinforce the big Christian affirmations.

The other feature of the Congress was the way in which the question of reunion was dealt with. The Congress took the bold step of inviting representatives of other Churches to state their position. And so we have here papers by a Greek Metropolitan, a German Lutheran (Dr. Deissmann), a Scottish Presbyterian (Lord Sands), a Congregationalist (Dr. Garvie), and a Wesleyan (Dr. Lofthouse). This was a most enlightened policy, and will do more to prepare the way for reunion than the ordinary conferences of men who all hold the same views.

The volume before us is of exceptional value. It makes excellent reading and offers from various angles a satisfying apologetic.

The Adult School Lesson Handbook for 1929 bears the title *The Wide Horizon* (National Adult School Union; 1s. 6d. net). It is planned on the usual broad lines. There is a little science, a little biography, some Biblical studies, and both art and poetry are included. It is all meant to widen the horizon of the pupil, and it will succeed admirably in this aim. The lessons are carefully and intelligently prepared. They are lavishly illustrated from literature and biography, and they are based on suitable Scripture passages. These Adult School Handbooks can be cordially commended for use in classes and even for private study. Whoever 'W. A. V.' is, he knows how to teach, and he is not afraid to take his coat off to the work.

A quaint and not uninforming book on the 'future of the pulpit' bears the title *Eutychnus*, and is written by Winifred Holtby (Kegan Paul; 2s. 6d. net). It belongs to a series of volumes each bearing a suggestive name as its title—'Daedalus; or, Science and the Future,' 'Hypatia; or, Woman and Knowledge,' 'Timotheus; or, The Future of the Theatre,' and so on through pages of titles. *Eutychnus* takes the form of a dialogue (or is it trialogue?) in which Archbishop Fenelon, representing ecclesiastical tradition, Anthony, a young man of free 'modern' views, and Eutychnus, standing for the plain man, toss the ball to one another. They discuss the Pulpit and the Churches, the Pulpit and the Platform, and the Pulpit and the Congregation. There is a good deal of humour and a good deal of sense and an occasional pinch of malice in the argument. The play is carried on with zest and with many a shrewd thrust, but on the whole with good humour and fairness. And we are left a little wiser in the end.

True Religion (Murray; 3s. 6d. net) is a collection of thirteen sermons by the late Dean of Salisbury. It will be given immediate welcome by that public which Dr. Page-Roberts gained by his earlier volume, *Law and God*—now in its fifth edition. Dr. Page-Roberts was always slow to publish his sermons, and it was only a short time before his death that he consented to the publication of this—his last volume. Dr. Page-Roberts was severe with himself. He did not rest satisfied until he had made his thought as clear as possible, and he was fearless in following it out to its conclusion.

No one can read the sermons without feeling the aroma of the Dean's own spirituality. We have given the first sermon—abbreviated—in 'The Christian Year.'

The World Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925 set up a Continuation Committee to carry on its work. The Committee in turn appointed a Youth Commission which was deputed to estimate the present situation in the world of the relation of youth to the Church. The Commission has now drawn up its report, which is edited by Basil Mathews, M.A., Lucy Gardner, and Dr. Erich Stange. It deals with all the aspects of the youth question as bearing on the world-situation to-day. 'Currents in the Life of Youth,' 'The Work of the Church for Youth,' 'The Church and Industrial Youth,' 'The Church and Educated Youth,' 'Education for International Peace,' and 'The Presentation of Christianity to the New Generation' are the chief subjects dealt with by a variety of writers, British, American, and Continental. It is to be hoped that this book will circulate widely and that its message will reach those for whom it is intended. The writers are all experts in their own field, and a competent survey is made of the whole situation. The title of the book is *Youth and the Church* (Pilgrim Press; 2s. 6d. net).

The Religious Tract Society has done good service in publishing the life-story of *John Pearce* (7s. 6d. net), a man described by Sir J. E. Kynaston Studd, the Lord Mayor of the City of London, as having always had his 'great esteem and respect for his integrity, courage, and perseverance,' and to whom temperance owes a great deal as a pioneer in the provision of cheap and wholesome catering for working people. It has been so graphically written by Miss Marguerite Williams that it can be said with confidence that few readers will lay it down until they have read it from cover to cover. Here is a man of fourscore years 'not out' who, though born in one of the poorest homes in one of the worst quarters of East London and subject to unspeakable hardships in his earliest struggles to earn a living honestly, nevertheless by his unflinching courage, ingenuity, and industry won his way to fortune and distinction. His affection for his widowed mother enabled him to face every hardship, and in his later life his religion taught him that honesty was the only policy. He began life with a coster-barrow, a coffee urn and six cups and saucers, as a caterer at a London street corner

of a cup of coffee with a thick slice of bread and butter or marmalade for a penny. In his old age he has built a temperance hotel, controls many restaurants, and in the social and religious life of London has played a notable part. Two of the most adverse influences to-day, he says, are the dole and bad housing. 'If there had been a dole sixty years ago I should never have got on.'

A helpful little book of talks to girls and young women is issued by the Religious Tract Society under the title *To the Dwelling of Light*, by Miss Lily Watson (3s. 6d. net). The subjects are such as these: 'What Shall We Make of Life?' 'The Written Word' (an excellent piece of guidance for Bible-reading), 'Happiness and the Quest,' 'Home Environment,' and so on. There is a mingling of sense and idealism which should make an appeal to girls of the adolescent age and even to those who are older.

The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation, by Mr. J. B. Walker (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net), is an earnest and in many respects able argument aiming to establish the conclusion 'that the religion of the Bible is from God, and divinely adapted to produce the greatest present and eternal spiritual good of the human family.' The reasoning will not appeal to every one, and perhaps the writer has too great a confidence in the power of logic to convince the unbelieving. But the book is fitted to confirm faith in the reality of a Divine revelation and the saving power of the gospel.

In *The Mysteries of Britain*, by Mr. Lewis Spence (Rider; 10s. 6d. net), an author already known for his writings on occultism and his detailed study of the problem of Atlantis, an effort is made to prove that Britain in ancient times was regarded by Continental nations as an *insula sacra* or special centre of mystical faith and psychic tradition. This British cult, it is contended, had no connexion with the East but reached our shores from north-west Africa. It is futile, the writer states, to appeal to Oriental occult sources when we have an ancient and prior tradition 'of our very own,' which can still be regained and utilized by British mystics. Not many readers will agree with the author's views of such matters, or his hope that the British people will yet embrace this native 'soul-philosophy' in preference to their present faith. His call for patriotic mystics to restore the secret rites and traditions of ancient Britain will fall, we imagine, on deaf ears, in these days of enlightenment.

But as the book contains numerous data on Druidism (which he holds to be a cult of the dead), Celtic customs, Welsh Literature, and allied subjects, it may be useful to readers interested in British folklore and archæology.

It is not often that an author has the pleasure of issuing a new and revised edition after thirty years. This has been the experience of Mr. W. Fiddian Moulton with *The Old World and the New Faith* (Sharp; 4s. net). The book gives a concise and handy account of the historical framework of early Christianity, and especially of St. Paul's work. Originally published in 1896, 'before the name of Hastings had begun to mean anything to Bible students,' it has been brought up to date and may be thoroughly relied on for that careful and accurate scholarship with which the name of Moulton is synonymous.

Christian Thought, by the Rev. F. W. Butler (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is defined in its sub-title as 'A Grammar of Reinterpretation.' The writer, whose competence in the fields of philosophy and theology is widely known and acknowledged, sets forth an outline of how Christianity may be re-interpreted in terms of the thought of to-day. He has no sympathy with those who would separate religion and metaphysics. We must believe that the things we seek are to be found not only in our hearts but in the heart of the universe itself. 'The truth of religion consists in its being an answer to the ultimate problems.' It is impossible in a brief notice to indicate the course of his closely knit argument, but the following may give some idea both of the conclusion of the argument and of the writer's style. 'The finality which we affirm for Christianity is essentially finality in religion, and it attains a comprehensive and unified system of metaphysics on that religious base. Occupying this central position for the actual life and meaning of the soul it may well sow itself upon every wind of thought. In past ages it found means of self-expression through the thought of Greece and Rome investing temporary terminology with its own distinctive content. By the same warrant and carrying forward its heritage in the riches of the Gentiles it may find its way prepared before it in the rich fields of spiritual aspiration and thought of that East where now, as in a former day of mystery and vision, rises a star.'

Messrs. Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd. are steadily adding to their 'People's Pulpit' Series of half-

crown volumes of sermons by distinguished preachers, Anglicans and Nonconformists. Among the volumes just issued the most notable is *The Gospel for the Modern Mind*, by the Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L., a sermon out of which will be found in an abridged form in 'The Christian Year.' There are others quite worthy to take their place with it; for example, *The Simplicities of Religion*, by the Rev. F. L. Riches Lowe, a title that happily describes its contents; *The Angel of the Presence*, by the Rev. W. J. Coates, B.D.; *Does God Care?* by the Rev. F. C. Spurr of Birmingham, that centre of effective preaching for generations; *The Gospel for To-day*, by the Rev. Thomas Hancocks, Rams-gate. The publishers do not appear to have yet tapped the riches to be found in the Scottish pulpits of our time.

The Soul's Quest, by the Rev. J. H. Ward, M.A., Preston (3s. 6d.), from the same publishers, is a series of suggestive and really helpful lectures to a group of workers in office, factory, or shop. They were intended to make plain to his hearers who had not thought very deeply on the subject some of the vital things in our religion. The minister dealing with his Bible class will find methods of treatment worthy of his study. —

We could not imagine a more lucid initiation into the modern approach to the Bible than the truly admirable sketch which the Rev. W. J. Foxell, M.A., Ph.D., has given us in his *Outlines of Biblical Criticism* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net). It is succinct, but as clear as a bell, and it touches everything of vital importance in both Testaments—law, prophecy, apocalyptic, the synoptic problem, the principles of textual and literary criticism. The discussion does not lose itself in generalities, but is illuminated at every point by concrete illustrations, which, even in textual and critical matters, are so

divested of all complexity as to appeal to the layman innocent of criticism. Problems, as the writer pithily says, are 'not to be shelved, but to be solved,' and he convincingly shows how honest and capable scholars are trying to solve them.

In *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. viii. (1926-1927), just issued (Yale University Press), and edited for the trustees by Henry J. Cadbury, we have an excellent article of thirty-three pages by Dr. Ephraim A. Speiser of the Baghdad staff on Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal; some notes by Raymond P. Dougherty of Yale University on 'A Few Miscellaneous Antiquities Secured from Arabs in the Neighbourhood of Warka in Southern Babylonia'; a valuable discussion by Professor Barton of the University of Pennsylvania on the 'So-called Sumero-Indian Seals'; and an interesting chapter by Professor Moulton of Bangor Theological Seminary describing the history of the Old American Palestine Exploration Society. There is not much in the volume, except perhaps the last-named chapter, which is of interest to Biblical scholars. The Society referred to had its beginning in New York in 1870, in a desire to aid the English one, but it ultimately failed, partly through the magnitude of the project it undertook, partly through the employment of military engineers who were without any particular knowledge of Bible learning or interest in such, and partly through a distressing financial situation at home. Fortunately, the first two of these difficulties have long since vanished. The American Schools have now leadership of superlative quality and are able for large undertakings, as the splendid accomplishments of recent years prove. The *Annual* has numerous illustrations and a large folding map to explain the Zamuan wars.

Leaders of Theological Thought.

George Tyrrell.

By WILL SPENS, C.B.E., M.A., MASTER OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

No Roman Catholic, at least no English Roman Catholic, who has any adequate sense of the problems involved in defending and presenting Roman Catholicism, in face of historical and other criticism, would hesitate to acknowledge his debt to Cardinal

Newman. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* introduced principles and points of view by means of which it was immensely easier to meet such criticisms and, carrying the war into the enemies' country, to maintain that Catholicism, as

interpreted and defended by Newman, did not merely best satisfy certain religious cravings, but afforded the best account and the most satisfactory defence of supernatural religion. Catholic theologians there were who repudiated Newman's interpretation, realizing its implications : and there were many more, propagandists if not theologians, who, while they accepted the doctrine of development as a convenient reply to Protestant critics, continued to teach in practice views with which this was inconsistent. But, so far at least as an outsider can form an opinion, and on this point it is perhaps the outsider who can best form an opinion, however much it may be true that within the Catholic fold teaching is given in many instances which has its only possible background in earlier conceptions of the history of dogma, those principles and points of view which Newman introduced, and the adoption of which his writings widely stimulated, are the necessary basis of any presentation of Roman Catholicism which commands serious attention at the present time. The point which I am concerned to make is that a close parallel exists in the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Anglican Church. In Anglo-Catholic circles there is very commonly, indeed, teaching which depends on conceptions of dogma altogether alien to those inspired originally by George Tyrrell. Conceptions of dogma originally inspired by him are playing, however, an increasing part, afford, as other conceptions do not afford, a justification of a position which is at first sight peculiarly illogical or perverse ; and do so not as an argument *ad hoc*, but as a by-product of work which is primarily concerned in providing an adequate defence of supernatural religion, of a Catholic type, in face of modern difficulties. In either case, the debt is due to a man who fought out his intellectual position in endeavouring to defend a different system and in reaction from that system. But there is this difference. Newman was received into the Roman Catholic Church and lived to hold the highest rank in that Church which it was possible for him to hold. Tyrrell was excommunicated, but he never left the Roman obedience, to the end sought to defend Roman Catholicism by conceptions which Rome persistently condemned, and never developed them in any one of those atmospheres to which he inclined to recognize they were more congenial. As a natural consequence, while Roman Catholic theologians may fairly be described as disciples of Newman, it can hardly be said with the same truth that any Anglo-Catholic writers are disciples of Tyrrell. They found it necessary to reject too

many of his views and to modify the rest too much for this to be other than a somewhat misleading description. But their debt remains. When the Modernist movement collapsed in the Roman Catholic Church, ideas which it had originated, or at the least given greatly increased currency, were taken up and developed by Anglican, and more particularly by Anglo-Catholic, writers.

Of the many lines of approach to current problems, or attempted solutions of these problems, to which the Modernist movement had given rise or currency, very many were rapidly dropped. Even a more sympathetic consideration served only to confirm the judgment of the Roman Catholic authorities that they were inconsistent with the Christianity which they purported to defend. To a considerable extent this was the case with the work of Tyrrell as well as with the work of others. But it was so in a less degree and with an exception which was so important and with qualifications which are so considerable as to place his work in a special position. The purpose of the present article is to emphasize the importance of that exception.

The exception in question is Tyrrell's philosophy of dogma ; his distinction between dogma and theology ; his conception of dogma as prophetic, the outcome of religious experience determined by correspondence with experience, and of theology as the attempt to work out an adequate intellectual rationalization ; and, as a pendant, his insistence, as against an extreme doctrine of development, that 'the revelations of those who knew Christ personally must naturally differ in kind from later revelations and be venerated as classical and normative.' The whole position which I have thus summarized finds its best expression in *Through Scylla and Charybdis*, and more especially in the eighth chapter, from the introduction to which this quotation is taken. Another is even more important. This brief introduction to the chapter in question includes the following : 'Finally, though Revelation and Dogma do not control Theology as statement controls statement, they control it as a science is controlled by its subject-matter.' I am not concerned in this article to give a detailed account of Tyrrell's position, but rather to emphasize the importance of his work by describing the attitude to dogma to which it has given rise. There is, however, no better basis for such a discussion than the sentence which has just been quoted. Another, also from the same chapter, may be added : 'Traditional belief, so far as it is the product of the collective and continuous ex-

perience of the community and has not been sophisticated by theology, has that critical superiority over science which the concrete has over the abstract; it is critically valuable, not as an explanation but as embodying or implying the phenomenon to be explained. Its artless constructions of history and science and philosophy may crumble under the touch of criticism; but this latter will be condemned unless its reconstruction finds room for all that revelation strove to shelter.' The word 'revelation' is here to be understood 'to cover the whole complexus of beliefs reached through religious experience.'

The essence of the resulting position is the assertion that dogma has its fundamental significance in view of proved value as a guide to religious experience, and free use is of course made of the analogy to science which this suggests. Any theology must conserve and account for the value of dogmas as a guide to religious experience, just as any reconstruction of scientific theory must conserve and account for the value of earlier theories as a guide to physical experience. The fundamental problem is, clearly, how far this analogy is valid. It is frequently assumed (as, for example, by Dr. Tennant in his *Philosophical Theology*) that the very great dependence of religious experience on religious beliefs invalidates any such position, and that all which is necessary in order to dismiss any such position is to establish the existence of such dependence. Since no one disputes at least a very high degree of dependence, the critic's task on that assumption becomes easy. Where the critic is open to criticism is in his assumption. Obvious as that may appear at first sight, it is open to the charge that it involves a considerable simplification of the problem and a simplification which does not cover the facts, and which affords its conclusion precisely because of the absence of adequate analysis. In the first place, it is necessary to insist that the subjective factor is far less complete than the critic's argument usually requires. It is not the case that any belief which logically implies the possibility of something which might be called religious experience will, if strongly held, lead to that experience. The range of possible experience appears to be determined, and that somewhat narrowly. Again, of a variety of beliefs which all imply a particular experience, by no means all lead equally well to that experience. Not all conceptions, for example, of God, or even of a beneficent God, yield equally well either adoration or the fruits of adoration in an abiding effect on character; and it is not easy to account for the

facts in question apart from objective determination. Again, analysis of the nature of the dependence of religious experience on belief is possible in a considerable degree, and is highly significant. It is necessary to draw a distinction between the beliefs which are held and the 'mental attitudes' which these imply and to which they lead: and when this distinction is drawn it appears to be clear that it is particular 'mental attitudes' which determine the resulting religious experiences and that the beliefs only do so, mediately, by leading to the mental attitudes.

The implications of this fact, if it be a fact, are so obvious and important that it is desirable to say something in justification of this analysis. It depends on two quite broad ranges of fact, neither of which can well be disputed. In the first place, very different religious beliefs lead not uncommonly to closely similar religious experience. When, however, this is the case, the particular mental attitudes which the beliefs yield will be found also to be closely similar. Very striking examples are afforded in the field of mystical experience in different religions, but examples are by no means confined to that field. In the second place, a crucial test of such an analysis would be afforded if it is possible in certain cases to secure a particular mental attitude, which normally depends on a particular belief or on particular beliefs, apart from any of these beliefs, and if the normal experience still results. Now that is in fact possible and, so far as can be determined, the normal experience does result at the least in a very high degree. The most obvious, and a very good, example is afforded by the agnostic or atheist who is present at a great act of worship and who, through sympathy or through the atmosphere created by the music, etc., combined with some sympathy, is enabled to share the 'mental attitude' of the believers. We are all familiar with such cases, and we are all familiar with the fact that there does result in such cases in a very marked degree the same fruits which result for the believer; for example, a definite gain in joy, peace, and charity, persisting as in the normal case at least for a time.

It, of course, does not follow because some belief affords an explanation of the results of certain mental attitudes to which it leads that this explanation is the true explanation. It does follow that we are dealing with a field of experience such that if particular explanations increasingly fit into a coherent whole and if, as is the case, doctrines which have their origin in some particular type of experience are found to afford at once a guide

to experience, and an explanation of experience, in other fields of religious experience, then very strong grounds exist in theology as in science for holding that the resulting system of thought constitutes our truest available outlook.

Before passing from this very brief indication of the lines along which it is possible to defend empiricism in theology to an equally brief indication of the results of such a view, certain points should be noticed. In the first place, any one in any degree familiar with such discussions is only too well aware that it is necessary on every occasion to make clear that the term 'religious experience' is not intended to connote emotional thrills, of which the empiricist is apt to be even more suspicious than his neighbours. Nor has it primarily in view, although it of course includes, unusual experiences; for example, those of the mystics. What is primarily in view is all that range of experience which is *normally* rationalized so as to involve a very direct reference to theism, and which includes *amor dei* (regarded as being *sui generis*), the capacity for worship and its results direct and indirect, the sense of sin and of forgiveness, sanctity (as opposed to mere virtue or piety), the sense of duty and vocation, and a number of other capacities and results which are in general as widespread as religion. In the second place, the theistic assumption need not merely be taken for metaphysics. It is afforded independent ground in the fact that on that basis a coherent system can be constructed which affords *in detail* a chart and an explanation of very diverse experiences, and in the fact that as men's 'sense of fitness' is found to be a sound guide in the field of religion, it is found to affirm theism, as an intuitive judgment, with more than ordinary force. The latter consideration is, as I believe, the more important of the two: but, if it is to be freed from the appearance of a vicious circle, more space is required than is now available.

What is the upshot of this empiricism in theology? In the first place, it may be noted that it accords at once and without effort with the teaching of the Gospels as to the test of doctrine, and in this respect has a great advantage over either rationalism or belief in some infallible oracle. The upholders of rationalism, especially but not only in its extreme forms, are bound to lay an emphasis on intellectual power which for better or worse is strikingly absent in the gospel teaching. The objection to belief in this or that infallible oracle turns not merely on the degree in which isolated texts have to be pressed to support the belief, but on the fact that there is direct and well-marked teaching pointing in another

direction, towards empiricism. Further, men do in fact believe because of their own and other people's experience of religion and in light of intuitions which emerge from this experience. Unless empiricism can be justified, we are in grave danger of justifying at most the content of their belief but not their believing.

The use which can be made in the interests of a liberal catholicism of such a conception of dogma as has been indicated is sufficiently obvious to need little development. It is claimed both that theology must take account of the proved value of any doctrine as a guide to experience which can fairly be regarded as religious, and that in so far as any system of thought exists which has been primarily determined by such experience, and which incorporates (and synthesizes into its system) the vital ideas in other religions, that system has a legitimate claim to be regarded as our truest available outlook. And such a claim is made on behalf of Catholic theology. It would be neither possible nor in place to discuss that claim in detail. But certain points should be noted. In the first place, from the point of view in question, the very great influence of devotional experience on Catholic theology, in that this theology has followed, at least as much as it has guided, devotion becomes a welcome phenomenon. The same is true of the syncretist and synthetic tendencies in Catholicism. In this connexion it is to be noted that the case advanced for Catholicism turns not only on the success of Catholicism in producing the 'fruits of the Spirit' in a wide variety of persons, and as a school for saints of very diverse types, but in this synthetic character. It is claimed that it is scarcely too much to say that there is no 'mental attitude' which has proved of value in any religion which does not find a rationalization in the Catholic system. Further, where the phenomena are highly significant even if far from valuable, as in the case of sex and religion, it is claimed that here also the facts fall into place in the Catholic system through its insistence on the importance of concupiscence. As against reactions within Christianity it is claimed that the Catholic dogmatic system itself justifies the vital ideas in these reactions: that what is wrong on the Protestant side lies in negations, which are not really necessary and ignore religious experience of other types; and on the side of traditional Catholicism that there is failure to allow for diversities of temperament and to recognize that corresponding differences of emphasis and variation in religious practice are inevitable and desirable.

As has been said, it is not possible to do more than indicate in general terms the position in question, which largely owed its origin to Tyrrell's influence, and which is, in fact, in greater or less degree the position of a well-marked school of Anglo-Catholic writers. But two or three details deserve to be noted. In the first place, the argument is very often less simple than any brief summary serves to suggest. The case, for example, for a sacramental cultus is not merely that such a cultus does, in fact, appear to lead to fruits of the Spirit in many cases in a marked degree. What may be called the 'subjective conditionment' of experience by belief must be recognized. It is always possible, and frequently happens, that, owing to lack of education, or owing to a particular religious tradition, vital ideas can only be made effective under forms which are crude and in themselves indefensible; that, for example, idolatry may at a certain stage help religion by making it easier in certain cases for men to feel the reality and objectivity of God. In consequence, any defence of a sacramental cultus would involve not only reference to its immediate results in itself but the assertion that it proved consistent with and was, in fact, found to assist other forms of devotion, which forms presupposed and required a capacity for purely mental prayer at least equal to that which is found in cases in which emphasis is exclusively laid upon such prayer.

Again, the necessary element of liberalism is supplied not by editing a dogmatic system, rejecting certain items and retaining others, but by recognizing the fact that throughout, in a greater or less degree and very often to an extent which at any given time cannot be fully determined, an element of symbol enters into the whole and into every part. There is, indeed, no point at which the analogy of scientific thought, with its necessarily symbolic character and even unresolved contradictions, can be more usefully pressed in the interests of apologetics. Lastly, there is a point to which reference has already been made. The traditional criticism of Anglo-Catholicism is that it makes an arbitrary selection between Roman Catholic doctrines, choosing those it likes and rejecting those which it finds inconvenient or inconsistent with its existence. In fact, however, as the late G. C. Rawlinson used to point out, those which it accepts are those which have direct devotional significance; those which it rejects are those which have been excogitated through treating theology as philosophy or in the attempt to supply an authority for the doctrines in question, an authority which should be

supplied by their devotional value. From the point of view which has been indicated the selection in question ceases to be arbitrary; becoming natural and indeed inevitable.

Enough has been said to illustrate the extent and the manner in which modern Anglo-Catholicism is indebted to Tyrrell. It is necessary to indicate the most important points in which, even when consciously indebted, it would diverge sharply from his views. No Anglo-Catholic writer of my acquaintance would accept his Christology or his account of the apocalyptic element in our Lord's teaching. In regard to the former, it would be generally said that Tyrrell fails to provide, to the extent which he appears to have supposed, an adequate rationalization of that attitude to our Lord which Christian experience attests. In regard to the latter it would, I think, be maintained that more must be claimed than Tyrrell claims. In particular it would be urged that, however much our Lord was limited in thought as well as expression by available conceptions, those he adopted, modified, and used would only be well chosen and well employed if great significance is given to what took place in the generation succeeding His death. Clearly, no simple equation of the Kingdom to the Church is in any way tolerable; but a high valuation of the significance not only of Pentecost but of the Church, and of its reaching a point at which its further spreading became inevitable, would appear to be a necessary element in any adequate solution.

Tyrrell's greatest work lay not in his theology (where inevitably he was seeking and consciously seeking solutions as best he could towards the end of his life), but in the philosophy of theology and of dogma. The general bearing of this, I have tried to indicate, but I would wish to emphasize, in conclusion, two further considerations which seem to me of very special importance. Tyrrell insisted at length and constantly on the significance of any consensus depending on that consensus being free and not managed. That view has been largely adopted in Anglo-Catholic circles, and its adoption is responsible for a changing attitude in regard to the tolerance of even extreme liberals. Heresy hunts are becoming less popular in Anglo-Catholic circles, especially among the younger men, not because there is more sympathy with the opinions in question, but because it is realized that any adequate authority for their rejection must depend on a free and not a managed consensus. Secondly, later developments of Newman's doctrine of development tended to place the New Testament in the

position of supplying merely the first, and fullest, chapters in Christian revelation. Tyrrell's insistence on the normative character of the experiences to which the New Testament gave expression has done much to correct this tendency ;

and even if his own statement of the relations of New Testament and later conceptions is not entirely adequate, he is the father of a conception of theology which does much to facilitate a solution.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Keep your Flag Flying.

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD BICKLEY, B.D.,
NORTHAMPTON.

'I will never disown you' (Moffatt).—Mk 14³¹.

HAVE you ever noticed a tall flagstaff on the west tower of the Houses of Parliament in London? Big Ben is in one tower, and the flagstaff is on the tower at the other end of the building. Whenever the Union Jack is flying from that flagstaff, every one knows that Parliament is sitting. Do you know, too, that there is a special staff of men, ex-sailors, living in the tower, and it is their special duty to keep the flag flying? Perhaps you think they have a very easy task. It isn't an easy task, for the Victoria Tower is three hundred feet high, and the flagstaff rises one hundred and twenty feet above that. It needs a very large flag for people in the streets below to see it at that height. The largest flag they use in fine weather is thirty-six feet by twenty-four. When the weather is rough and the wind is strong, it is very difficult to haul that big Union Jack up and down. To do this there are two hauling-jacks fitted to the flagstaff, so that if one gets tangled the other may be used. Once there was only one hauling-jack, and then one day something unfortunate happened, which none of the sailors like to hear mentioned. It was a very rough and windy day, and, when they tried to haul down the flag, they couldn't move it, it was so badly tangled with the tackle. So one of the sailors volunteered to climb up a guy-chain on the flagstaff and straighten it out. It was a very difficult and dangerous thing to do, to climb a pole four hundred feet above the ground in very rough weather. But the brave sailor did it, and after that happening another hauling-jack was fitted.

The sailors take great care of their flag; they watch it carefully when it is flying. Every tear or

fray has to be mended immediately it is seen, or the strong wind would tear the flag to shreds. There is a special room in the tower set apart for the repairing, and the sailors do all the sewing.

You would never think that so much skilful work and careful watching were needed to fly a flag. But it is a difficult task to keep *that* flag flying—almost as hard as it is for you and me to keep our flag flying. Every one of us must fly our flag; we must show our colours, let people see to whom we belong and whom we serve. Older people sometimes talk about 'flying the flag of our faith,' that is, showing people that we belong to Jesus Christ, and that we are not ashamed of it. When we are tempted to do wrong, when our companions are not talking straight and clean, when others want us to go with them to do the things we know Jesus wouldn't like, then it is a brave thing to keep our flag flying for Jesus in such rough weather.

One night one of Jesus' closest friends hauled down his flag, because he was afraid to let any one know he was a follower of Jesus. It happened on the very last night that Jesus was on earth, just before He went to die on the Cross. Jesus was unjustly and cruelly taken prisoner and brought to the Judgment Hall. Peter, His friend, followed afar off, and while Jesus was inside the Hall, Peter crept into the courtyard to watch what was going to happen. As he stood by a fire some one came up to him, and said, 'You are a friend of Jesus, aren't you?' Peter was afraid that he might be taken to prison if he said he was a friend of Jesus, so he denied it. 'No, I am not His friend, I don't know Him.' That was a cowardly thing to do. Peter hauled down his flag badly that night. He was afraid to show his colours. Then he looked to see where Jesus was. He wondered whether He had heard his denial, and through the faint light he saw the eyes of Jesus were fixed on him. There was such a sad and pained look in those eyes, it made Peter thoroughly ashamed of himself.

He never forgot that look of his best friend he disowned. Never again was he ashamed of Jesus. He flew the flag of his faith afterwards; he was proud of it even though he had to suffer for it. Every one who saw Peter then said, 'He is flying the flag of Jesus, we know who his Master is. He has been with Jesus, and is not ashamed to own Him.'

What is a Gentleman?

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT STRONG, M.A., B.LITT.,
LEEDS.

'I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.'—
Lk 22²⁷.

There have been from time to time some curious ideas as to what makes a gentleman, some making much of dress, or manners, or position in the world, but the best account I know has been put in this way, 'A gentleman is one who doesn't want to take more out of life than he is willing to put in.' That seems to get deeper than some of the other notions, because if once we have learned this way of looking at life, all the graces of behaviour will come in due course and without any difficulty. There have been some very fine gentlemen who could never afford very fine clothes, and some men have had rank in the world, although nobody could call them gentlemen in any real sense of the word.

If you want to see what the real gentleman is like, and to feel what a splendid fellow he is, it is worth while for a minute to look at this dreary picture of his opposite. Somebody asked the captain of a football team the other day a very interesting question. He said, 'Who is the greatest nuisance in your club?' and this was his reply. 'That's an easy question to answer. There is one in the club who is the terror of my life. He likes whatever glory there is going, and if we are going to play a specially important match, I know what to expect from him. He won't leave me alone, but worries me every day to give him a place in the team. He likes to see his name in the local paper and boast to his friends about being a good player and all the rest of it. If there happens to be a concert or a free tea given as a treat by a generous supporter, he is sure to be there, and he won't mind asking for free tickets for his friends. At the practice matches he isn't so much in the picture. It is really wonderful how many different excuses he can find in the course of a season for not doing his share like the others. If I put him in the team, I am bound to hear a good deal of grumbling from them,

and he does give them something to complain about. He thinks he is the only one who matters in the game, and his silly selfishness has lost us so many goals that I put him down as easily the greatest nuisance I have to deal with.' That was pretty plain speaking, and if ever you have to meet anybody like that, you will find yourself saying, 'What a pity he never learned to be a gentleman.'

Have you ever noticed how Jesus shines out as our glorious example in this, as in so many other ways? He did not busy Himself and worry other people by making big and constant demands on life. Wherever He came, people were set at ease, for He was not desiring fuss and ceremony. He simply came into every situation as it arose, giving joy and help and understanding. He was not complaining, but was showing how little He asked of life when He said one day, 'Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' He was content that life should offer Him one great thing—the chance of service, so that He could say with truth, 'I am in the midst of you as one that serveth.' See how rich and varied and interesting that life of little demand and much service was. The gospel story is full of incidents showing Him at hand in the moments of special need. What we have written down is a very small part of the story of His service, and we can understand what that writer meant when he said, that if the whole story were to be written, the world itself would not be big enough to contain the books that should be written.

Those who have followed the Lord Jesus most closely have learned from Him this way of giving themselves in joyful service, and in every case their lives have become powerful and beautiful. They have never needed to read books telling them how to behave, for something within them has told them this in a very effective way. They have given themselves joyfully, and so they could never be rude and insolent in manner, because they have loved others far too much for that ever to be possible. The worst manners in the world come out of pride, and real followers of the Master have conquered that evil spirit. If a man is selfish and proud, he will think so much of himself, and want so much for himself, that it will be all too easy for him to push others out of the way, forgetting that in a world like this there is a constant demand for courtesy and kindly consideration. That is to say, the world is always needing gentlemen who don't try to take more out of life than they are willing to put in.

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Pilate.

'Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him.'—Mk 15¹⁴.

1. Perhaps it is in this way, and no other, that all the evil in the world has come about. Some one fails to do his part. He knows what he ought to do, what he would even like to do. But he sees that, if he acts as he knows he ought to act, his action will get him into trouble, or will arouse feelings in other people which will make it hard for him to continue in the old relations with them. This again will make it impossible for him to carry out some proposal or plan which he has in view, which if carried out is likely to have good consequences such as will outweigh the wrong done by his momentary moral obliquity. It is wrong on his part, he admits, to pay no heed to the uneasiness of his own soul. It is wrong to do wrong, or to permit wrong to be done. But then—so argues one who is using his mind as his accomplice rather than his guide—'life is a big thing' (which is true), meaning 'life is a careless thing' (which is not true, otherwise there would be no need for him to argue these delicate matters with himself), 'and one must weigh his actions, forecasting before he takes a step whether he will not be doing some greater harm later on.'

The sin of Pontius Pilate was the sin of acquiescence. It was not that he did wrong; it was that he did nothing. The world, as we have it, is simply the immense and unravelled result of the actions and inactions of an infinite number of people who have on the whole been, not so much bad people, as simply people who above everything wished to be as free of trouble as possible. Pontius Pilate is the patron saint of those who on a moral issue are prepared to take the line of least resistance. They often call themselves practical men. Now, when more than a certain number of people take the line of least resistance, mankind begins to fall away publicly from God.

2. Christ standing before Pilate: *that* was a situation, a contrast which could not but be perceived as having about it something typical and dramatic and enduring. We have only to see them face to face to feel in the depths of our soul what God meant man to be. Of course, like Pilate himself we may juggle with our own inveterate moral instinct. We may whip up reasons upon reasons

for refusing to see life so simply as that. But all the time we know we are putting pressure upon ourselves, like an advocate with a desperate brief. There they stand—a kind of snapshot taken by God Himself—and no man can claim to be a man who, looking at the one and the other, does not see his way. We have the habit of saying, 'Christ before Pilate.' What really we ought to say is, 'Pilate before Christ.' We feel that Christ can stand there for ever: it is Pilate who must get away.

It is the nearness of Christ to him which enables us to see Pilate. It was the nearness of Christ to him that almost succeeded in enabling Pilate to see himself. When in the grey afternoon we begin not to be able to see the letters on the printed page, we draw nearer to the window. Whereupon the letters stand out again in the whiter light. It is a great principle. And so we read that God sent His Son into the world that we might see ourselves, and become unhappy, and humble, and be saved. 'I came not to send peace, but a sword,' said Jesus; and who has not seen a sword of light flashing into a curtained room, and pointing intensely at something, like the very finger of God! And who has not had some such an experience in the inner chamber of his soul!

Was Pilate serious? Was he really impressed by Jesus? When his wife urged him to be careful, and told him of a dream she had had, had that the effect, even for a little while, of making Pilate more uneasy, or even of making him slightly afraid? Or was the whole thing in his view a merely local and troublesome incident in the varied responsibilities of a State official who has been appointed to the difficult business of holding down a conquered people, and preferably by adroitness, by going round rather than by going through?

We should, of course, like to believe that no one ever stood near to Christ without being the better for it. And yet we must not presume upon that. If it should turn out to be so—that no one ever stood near to Christ without becoming different and better—it will be one of the added glories of Heaven. But we must not be sure, or speak as though we knew for certain. We do know that, when he first encountered Jesus, Pilate was simply one of those natural men who are called upon to deal with an enormous number of matters which look small to them, because they do not feel them. We may say, too, that he was one who had settled down to a rather cynical and unenthusiastic view of life.

There is a kind of admiration of Jesus in his

behaviour. And yet it is an admiration of the man, accompanied by something like contempt for all that He stood for. 'I am sent to bear witness to the truth,' said Jesus. 'What is truth?' rejoined the other, with the weariness of a cosmopolitan, with a kind of regret that a simple man should be so enamoured of anything as to put his life in jeopardy for the sake of it.

We can answer none of these questions. It is no part of our business to answer them. The point for us is, that Jesus and Pilate represent two voices which accompany us all throughout our life from the cradle to the grave. It may even be that they are always facing each other on the stage of our inmost soul. There is the way of a final laughter at man; and there is the way of faith. There is the way of shrugging our shoulders as though saying, 'What does it matter?' and then washing our hands. And there is the way through life which, led by Christ, they take who hold that for man there is but one great misfortune, and that to receive an idea which exercises no influence upon his active life; to see something, to hear something, something which calls to us—and having seen it or heard it, to trample it under our feet in some strong and contracting deed.

But all Scripture is written for *our* edification; and we are here, not to bemuse our minds over Pilate, but to take precautions for the safety and honour of our own souls.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

True Religion.

'Faith which worketh by love.'—Gal 5^a.

These few words indicate the nature of religion, and clearly reveal the nature of the Christian religion. It ought not, in these days, to be necessary—and yet it is necessary—that people should be reminded of what religion really is, and of what the Christian religion really is—of what it is always, everywhere, under all circumstances, modes, or denominations. For there are things which are described as religion which have little or nothing to do with it. 'Every school,' said Emile Burnouf, 'which does not formally recognise a god is unable to form a religion.'

To many this must seem like a barren truism. Of course, they say, there can be no religion without a god. But it is becoming a fashion to describe phases of human life as religion which, as such, are quite independent of a Divine idea. The fiery

passions which flamed with such devastating fury at the French Revolution are held by its great historians to be a religion. 'Some people,' said Matthew Arnold, 'are for calling all high thought and feeling by the name of religion, according to that saying of Goethe, "He who has art and science has religion."' 'But,' said Arnold, 'let us use words as mankind generally uses them.'

There are some who charge the ministers of religion with intolerance and bigotry because they may say, of some scientific agnostic, or of some one who 'is an excellent husband and father and very nice indeed, with no vices and most agreeable and indeed decidedly clever,' that he is not religious. Why, he may not have the smallest intention of being religious! For religion is not merely assent to the existence of God or of powers superior to those of man with which man is in contact. Religion is the realization of such a Divine Presence in the life of the intellect, the emotions, and the will. Religion is not merely an intellectual perception. It is a personal dominating spiritual experience. Religion, from its lowest to its highest development, consists in the recognition of a power or entity superior to man; in the feelings which the nature or character of this superior power produces within the man; and in the conduct or cult outside the man which these feelings compel him to perform. Realized religion always involves, whatever the religion, a creed, a corresponding emotion, and an accordant practice. It is all these three in a unity indivisible and not in any one of them alone.

Take, for instance, one of the lowest forms of religion, that of the Izedis, or devil worshippers. The superior being of their faith is hostile to man. This is the creed. Because he is an enemy of man he is feared. This is the emotion. Because he is disposed to hurt and destroy mankind he must be propitiated, and his hostility appeased by sacrifices, human or animal, and served with flattering, slavish adulation, and magical symbols and ritualism. This is the conduct or cult produced. Just the same is it in our own religion, which is the nearest approximation to Divine reality obtainable in this life. It has the same three elements—the all Holy, the all perfect, the One all Good, which is the Supreme Good—even God; honour, reverence, love for this adorable Supreme Good; a life ruled in all things by devotion to this Supreme Good; evermore becoming conformed to it, like it, and one with it.

The three elements which constitute religion are indicated in the text. 'Faith' points to a creed; 'love' to the feeling or emotion; 'working' to

¹ J. A. Hutton, 'There They Crucified Him,' 111.

the practical outcome of this emotion—'Faith working through love.' The feeling, the emotion, is the element that deserves to be held as the innermost soul of religion, fusing by its vital heat the other two elements into an indivisible unity. For this reason you can have either of the other two alone, but you cannot have the feeling, the emotion alone.

Certainly there may be a creed without religion, and there may be admirable moral conduct without religion. But there cannot be a genuine feeling which is not a feeling towards something, which is not addressed to some object. So that feeling, emotion, necessarily implies an object. Feeling must have a creed. And it must produce a certain conduct. Feeling is the motor of action. Love must live for its object. And so it is truly said, 'If a man love me, he will keep my commandments.' Mill confessed that the soul of religion is feeling. His words are, 'The essence of religion is the strong, earnest direction of the emotions towards an ideal recognised as of the highest excellence.'

But there are very sensible people—very English people—who are at least suspicious of what they call emotional religion. But, because there are sickly and emasculating emotions, it does not follow that all our emotions are sickly and emasculating. Is the love of parents for their children, or of a patriot for his country, ignoble because it is an emotion? Religion as an emotion—implying, as it necessarily does, an object and a practical manifestation—is akin to the love of beauty in its many modes. Notwithstanding the pontifical oracle of Dr. Johnson, 'Intercourse between God and the human soul cannot be poetical'; it is akin to noble poetry, and finds one of its most congenial modes of expression in poetry. The psalm and the hymn are religion's native tongue, which finds its noblest expression in the prayers of Christ and in the Psalms of David. There are in the Bible old fascinating histories and lofty morality; the statesman's forecasts and the theologian's deductions. But Christ praying and David praising are religion indeed, and for evermore. Open the Psalter by chance, and one's heart begins to beat more quickly and light to glow in the eyes. 'I will magnify Thee, O God, my King, and I will praise Thy name for ever and ever. Great is the Lord and worthy to be praised. There is no end to His greatness. O praise God in His holiness; praise Him in the firmament of His Power. For this God is our God for ever and ever, He shall be our guide unto death.' Here is religion, playing upon its

harp for joy. And if we would behold religion in an hour of awful suspense, we must take our place at the Last Supper, and watch in the garden of Gethsemane.

But it is said by some, who do not want religion or who try to apologize for the absence of it from their special friends, 'We are quite content with the life of Christ.' To be like Christ would be to have the highest religion attainable by man, religion complete in the three elements of which we have spoken. But the actions of Christ's daily life cannot be separated from the faith on which it rested, and the love which inspired it. Agnosticism was He? Impossible! Here are His words on agnosticism: 'Holy Father, the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee.' If men take Christ as their ideal, they must take His religion also. He had no life apart from God. In spiritual exaltation and in mortal agony His soul was fastened upon God. His last cry was, 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.' There are those who, while they profess to believe all the articles of the Christian creed, are not religious. Their *realized* God is not the living God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Orthodoxy is their god, and orthodoxy as a realized god is a dead god, which strikes with chill the hearts of its worshippers, and offers an intellectual formula for the salvation of the soul. Why are they not religious, these strong pillars of ecclesiastical parties? Because they are without the emotion which is the vital force of religion, 'the faith working through love.' To such it may be said, 'I know you that ye have not the love of God in you.' For the Divine voice which ever sounds, but which we do not always hear or heed, is not, 'Give me thy orthodoxy, thy formal plan of salvation, thy Catholic Church, thy philosophy, or thy system of ethics.' It is, 'My Son, give me thy heart.'¹

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE EASTER.

The Example of the Cross.

'Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross.'—Mt 16²⁴.

We are accustomed to think of the Cross as the very sign of God. Yet, to begin with, it did not seem to come from any source so high: it was of man's most cruel manufacture. What tyrant was it who first conceived the idea of nailing criminals to a tree as men might nail vermin to a barn door?

¹ W. Page-Roberts, *True Religion*, 1.

The horrible practice arose in the East. It is known that the Persians had it, the Phœnicians, the Egyptians, the Carthaginians: the Romans are said to have adopted it in an attempt to imitate these last, their enemies, though Rome reserved it for slaves, for the most brutal criminals and for obscure provincials in remote corners of the Empire. But in shadowed ages before the thing entered into history some Eastern potentate, crazed with cruelty, drunk with contempt, invented *the death of the cross*, and flattered himself on having discovered a new way of dealing with refractory and seditious persons. He did not know it—that crazy, cruel man—but he had invented the supreme paradox of history; he had created a symbol in which all opposites might meet. The Divine Purpose wrought upon the matter in its deliberate way, and the heavenly throne had the last word upon the device of earthly tyranny. The Cross now speaks to all the world of human nature at its worst and at its best.

1. It is well to begin with the Example of the Cross, because, according to the Synoptic Gospels, it was there that the Master began in expounding this mystery to His disciples. The Cross as a reconciliation they were not yet fitted to understand, nor could they see the rose-red splendour which was going to spread from Calvary through the cold white light of theology. Here was where He began in opening to them the difficult lesson: 'From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things, and be killed. . . . Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.' The Cross being a visible thing in the world of that day, it is possible that the phrase, 'Take up the cross,' already had proverbial force: a man carrying his cross was known by all who saw him for one who had turned his back on life and was facing death, a man whose destiny was taken finally out of his own hands. Here was a bitter chill for young enthusiasm. In a world of hard roads and rough tempests they may have thought that they had discovered, under His leadership, a path of flowers. A place of execution was the last thing they expected to see. It was as if a teacher, having gathered his pupils round him in a pleasant meadow, had suddenly taken from under his mantle a hangman's rope and made that the symbol of their common enterprise.

2. But the disciples knew, as we know full well, our Lord's love of parables and pictures. This

figure of the cross was one of His greatest parables, a whole system of ethics condensed into a word—the ethics of self-denial, the ethics of unworldliness. He may take His symbols from time, but their meanings come from eternity: their commentary is in the nature of things. He Himself took up His cross long before He bowed His shoulder to lift the cross of wood; and His disciples also, in so far as they were true disciples, had to take up their cross, even though they might never be crucified on any hill of shame. Do many people nowadays read *Olrig Grange*? There are some things in it too wise and deep to be forgotten. The dying Thorold is speaking of his doubts and his certainties:

But all through life I see a Cross,
Where sons of God yield up their breath:
There is no gain except by loss,
There is no life except by death,
And no full vision but by Faith,
Nor glory but by bearing shame,
Nor Justice but by taking blame;
And that Eternal Passion saith,
'Be emptied of glory and right and name.'

3. Once the principle is accepted so, it may lead men to the major sufferings and sacrifices, if that be the will of God for them, as it led Christ to the Tree from which He reigns, or as it led the holy and blessed martyrs to the arena and the stake. In other cases—in the vast majority of cases to-day—it leads only to things which may have no heroic or splendid look in the eyes of the watching world; one man may find waiting for him a struggle with his temper, another with his laziness, a third with the clogging burden of ill-health, a fourth with a set of hostile circumstances and threatening temptations. Yet these things are not small, because they give the individual the opportunity of shouldering and carrying his cross, of merging his own will in the Divine will as the latter is progressively revealed to him, and of thus, while dying to self, finding that self new-made in the service of the Highest.

This needs reinforcement and proclamation to-day. The austere note has gone too much out of religion and life. Some one has remarked that the eighteenth century revolted against kings, the nineteenth revolted against priests, and the twentieth century is revolting against moralists. We must get the austere note back into life, but it will scarcely come unless it comes by way of religion. Men find it hard to love austerity for its own sake; they may come to love it and to live it, for Christ's sake. That was why to Thomas à Kempis the way

of the Cross was the royal way ; the Royal Feet had gone that way and he could not but follow, surrendered and adoring. And to those who still follow in that high, hard path, He who is Pioneer of the way is the Comrade of it too, so that beneath their burdens they are not unsupported, and in their loneliness they are not alone.

The royal rood with mist is white,
Below lies earth and its delight,
No song of land or sob of sea
To break the deep tranquillity,
Whose very stillness brings affright . . .
My soul is saddened in despite
Of faith and promises, then bright
Descends from Heaven's grey canopy
A Hand once marred on Calvary
And guides my feet to mount aright
The royal road.

It is a happy austerity which leads to the joy of such a fellowship and to the assurance of such an ultimate attainment.¹

EASTER DAY.

The Heart of Christianity.

'If ye then be risen with Christ.'—Col 3¹.

The heart of Christianity, its innermost sanctuary, its most dazzling glory, and the chief source of its power is not even the Cross. It is the open grave.

To me, indeed, the Cross must always be a very central thing. Whenever I wander far from Calvary, I, for one, begin to lose sight of the Master, and have to get back. And yet is there not real point in Michelangelo's indignant protest, when he turned in his stormy way upon his fellow-painters and demanded, 'Why do you keep filling gallery after gallery with endless pictures of the one ever-reiterated theme, of Christ in weakness, Christ upon the Cross, Christ dying, most of all Christ hanging dead? Why do you concentrate upon that passing episode, as if that were the last word and the final scene, as if the curtain dropped upon that horror of disaster and defeat? At worst, all that lasted for only a few hours. But to the end of unending eternity Christ is alive, Christ rules and reigns and triumphs.' And, if we would help people to be valiant in their Christian living, it is that we should be ringing out over the world; that Christ has won, that evil is toppling, that the end is sure, that nothing can for long resist our mighty and victorious Lord.

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 71.

That surely is the Easter note; yes, and the spirit that makes Christianity. We come to celebrate a triumph, and we are confronted with the symbols of an agony. Our hearts cry out, 'But we are past all that! Good Friday is Good Friday. And, while the darkness lasts, it is well and seemly to gather in it on that little hill; to grope our slow way through it toward that central cross; to stand there dumb and stunned, looking on Him whom we have pierced, till the thing comes home to us, rushes our soul, and storms our spirit, and forces us, whether we will or no, to love this mighty Lover who first so loved us. But Easter is Easter. The darkness, blessed be God's name, is gone. And we, who have been redeemed by precious blood, would join ourselves to those who are fully redeemed, would take our part in that long shout of praise and adoration with which yonder they acclaim the Christ who died once, but who is alive for evermore, who was indeed buried in weakness but who rose in power, who reigns upon God's throne, with the grim principalities that thought to master Him, beaten and down and cringing beneath His triumphing feet!'

It was Easter that made the Church. And it is Easter alone that can bring us through with our heads up and our hearts gallantly defiant. For it comes to us as a call to a higher life, aye, and, thank God, as a proof that we can win to it. Always what interests the men of the New Testament in Christ's rising is that they can reproduce it in their own experience. To them His life is not in any way unique, save in degree. For they who are Christ's are bound to follow Christ on to the very end. They, too, must go about doing good, in their Lord's way: they, too, must take their cross upon their shoulder and throw their life away for others in His fashion: they, too, must rise with Christ into a new and wonderful being, grow altogether different from what they were; must—aye, and can—become new creatures with new possibilities, new ways, new power.

It is a marvellous story that slow evolution of life from its crude beginnings up and up and up till man appears. How? No one knows. There is so huge a gulf yawning between him and the nearest of his kinsmen. Yet there he stands—a man, with a man's intellect and a man's heart and a man's conscience, living his life in a man's royal way. And that amazing thing was fashioned out of what was at the start only a living greed, an animate selfishness, a grasping, ever-open, ravenous mouth, and nothing more. And from that drab, sordid material God's cunning hands have wrought

out into being such adorable things—love, and self-sacrifice, and all the glories of humanity, all somehow made from that.

And we stare at them bewildered. For what to you is the most extraordinary thing in Scripture? To me it is not even the glorious figure of Christ; but rather this, that that wonderful thing did not dishearten people altogether, did not make them argue that, since this has been made out of a life like theirs, then their own blundering attempts, in view of this tremendous standard of achievement, are far, far worse than they have ever realized, and they had better give it up.

But in the Testament it is not so things acted on men's minds. Rather the fact of Christ stung them to a tremendous, an illimitable, an insane-looking hope. 'If ye then be risen with Christ,' Paul throws out, taking for granted that amazing assumption. To his mind that is the whole point and meaning of the thing. If you are Christ's at all, then of course you have left behind you the old life as a thing dead, and over, and forgotten, and are now living in His new and glorious way—are, or else can—quite surely can.

With incredulous eyes, that can hardly believe what stares at them, Paul sees that the great mass of people are in no way interested in the news he brings to them.

Bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,—

Hearing their one hope with an empty wonder,
Sadly contented in a show of things,

their faces never light, and in a little while they stretch themselves, and yawn, and drift away to other things. As if anything could matter but this that they might have, this he is pressing on them, this that is theirs for the taking! And they don't want it.

Think of a slave who might be done for ever with that misery of his—that shrinking figure, those cowed and furtive eyes, that timorous elbow thrown up all too quickly, ever ready for the expected blow—who might win back self-respect, and be a man again instead of that mere ugly thing he is. And he, given his choice of that, elects to remain this horror! You can be free, man! Free!

It is a desperate thing to meet with Christ. For once we do, we must close with Him or reject Him; must take His offered gifts or else push them impatiently aside; must be the better for Him or the worse. To the depths of our being He, too, tests us, and reveals unerringly what manner of souls we are. And how is it with you and me?

You can become like Christ! Given that message, does your heart thrill at the thought of it, and do your hands leap out to clutch it, and does your soul resolve that, whatever else you win or lose, this you are going to gain? Or do you listen blankly, and rise up and go your way, back to the life you left, precisely as you came? Do you not want this thing? Want it? you say. Of course I do! But I can't have it, and I know that now. But I am too old for anything to happen now. My ways are fixed; my character is formed; the channels are long cut in which my life must run on to the end; my feet turn of themselves now into worn and beaten paths.

I am not what I have, nor what I do,
But what I was I am, I am even I.

And it is too late to change now.

You can. That is the fact that we have got to grasp. 'I learned,' says Plutarch doggedly, 'that anger is not incurable if one wants to cure it.' It may mean endless pains! And who would grudge them for so wonderful a prize? Do you remember that old Buddhist who turned on his masterful passions, and hurled his truculent defiance in their faces. 'Although you conquer me a million times, I will spring up again a million and one times,' he cried; 'will never, never, never yield!'

And it might happen far more swiftly than we think. 'Thanks be to God,' cries Paul, 'who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' There evidently is a man who feels that he is winning, who knows it indeed, is sure he has got hold of something which enables him to face anything life or death can bring, and see it through with honour. This is a man fit for his life and able for his task. It is a happy condition. For there is no more miserable object than a man pitchforked into a job too big for him, and conscious of his own incompetence; a hunted soul, always just dodging the ruin never far away, and meantime never keeping step with duty, but always lagging farther and farther in the rear, while a huge mass of work undone keeps heaping itself up into a threatening avalanche which, when it moves, must overwhelm him in an irretrievable disaster.

But isn't that a too vivid picture of the lives of some of us? Oh, give us time, you say. Not yet, of course; but we hope something will come of it all some far-off day. That is the curse of religion, answers Dora Greenwell, that habit of translating into a vague future tense what Christ offers us now.

Life and death make a joyful Lent,
So they lead us to Easter day.

But how are we to reach it and begin this newness of life ?

There is no way to Easter but by Calvary. What we require is something that will push us into action, that will make us really choose what we know we should choose, yet do not choose. That is the reason of the Sacrament and the use of the Cross. Before you finally determine what you are going to do with life, be sure that you have all the facts before you. And this is one of them, this Cross. Here is one Claimant ! Have you given consideration to His rights ? Don't say (how can you upon Calvary ?) that it is useless trying. For, look ! does not the Cross prove that, in the same world as God, colossal failure is not failure, but a door that opens straight out into triumph for a loyal heart ! Keep looking ! for it will help you, force you, lay compulsion on you, till your hands leap out to take the cup and all it typifies. The Sacrament ! The recruit's oath of allegiance ! The vow that the young soldier swore before the battalion he was joining, that all he had, his life itself, was not his any longer, but the Emperor's, and that he would be true to him till death !

Yet stay ! Are you quite certain that you understand ? That recruit's oath took him into strange places—many a lonely vigil, many a breathless jeopardy ; meant weariness and wounds and perhaps a life tossed away with disdain rather than break or yield. 'Dare you drink of the cup that I shall drink of ?' asks the Master. Dare you ? Look into its depths again ! There are grace and forgiveness there, most surely there ! Yes, but far more ! There are self-sacrifice, you understand, and loyalty, and a determination that you too are going to live in this new way. And dare you ? Do you answer, looking straight into Christ's eyes, 'I can, I will, I do ; and, please God, I shall stand to it' ?

Why, then, the grub is changing to the butterfly ; and Christ's power is at work in you, making you like Himself ; and the poor shuffling thing you are is putting on His ways. For you Easter has really dawned : in you the new life has indeed begun.¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

How Jesus Christ makes Things Old-fashioned.

'And he spake also a parable unto them ; No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old ; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the

piece that was taken out of the new agreeth not with the old.'—Lk 5⁴⁶.

1. Readers to whom the two parables are familiar have not noticed that according to St. Luke two comments were added, one concerning each parable. 'When men have drunk the new wine they say, "The old is better."' Jesus revolutionized religion, but the spirit of the revolutionary was not His. He understood how people felt about the old religion and the old forms. There was something mellow and familiar about them, whereas the new seemed crude and strange.

When He said, 'The piece from the new cloth will not agree with the old,' he used the artist's eye. This piece of glowing scarlet, how dingy it made the old red garment look ; this vivid purple, how it shamed the stained violet of the old robe. The new makes the old look old. The old has to go. We are reminded of the words in the Epistle to the Hebrews : 'By saying a new covenant He antiquates the first. And whatever is antiquated and aged is on the verge of vanishing.' This is a picturesque statement of a principle. Jesus took a threefold attitude to old things.

Some old things He came to destroy. There was to be an end of them. They were infected, foul, useless. Their fate was destruction. Hatred, unforgiveness, materialism—He came to abolish them.

Other old things had something prophetic in them. They were to be fulfilled. There were seeds in them which He developed into full flower. Such were the Ten Commandments, fasting, the sacrificial instinct. He revitalized, deepened, and expanded them.

But there were other things which men would grow out of and leave behind. They would become obsolete. The time would come when they would look absurd. That, too, would be the result of His life and teaching. Some teachings Jesus neither condemned nor fulfilled, He simply made them appear foolish and unnecessary.

2. Think, for instance, of slavery. It was deeply embedded in the social life of Christ's day. We miss this fact because so often the Greek word for 'slave' is translated 'servant.' It seemed to most people unthinkable to get needful work done without slave-labour. There was a good way and a bad way of treating slaves, but to do without them altogether—that was impracticable. And Jesus did not lead a crusade against slavery, cruel and hideous though its tyranny often was. He simply taught that every man, bond or free, was precious to God ; that His followers' duty was to love their neighbours, including slaves, as really as they loved

¹ A. J. Gossip, *The Hero in Thy Soul*, 185.

themselves. He left that leaven to work. And it did work. It was not very long before Christians came to disuse slavery. The habit of freeing slaves during the life or at the death of the owner grew stronger. It was after all rather difficult to keep one whom you called 'Brother beloved' in the Church a slave in the household.

Then it was discovered that slavery is not an economic necessity. It took centuries before Christians finally made up their minds that it was not only unworthy, but also antiquated. It is fair to say that this new point of view has been finally reached. Not only the Church, but the whole civilized world has come to see that it was a mere survival of a barbarian stage of life.

3. Again, war is on the way to become obsolete. When the last great battleship was proceeding down the Tyne to the North Sea, a group of business men were standing on a jetty watching the great ship go on its first voyage seawards. One of them, a shipowner, said: 'I don't like the look of her.' When pressed to explain his meaning, he said it was because so much money was in one bottom. Another of the spectators, a stockbroker, chimed in, 'Yes, if we could have done without her it would have saved threepence in the pound in income-tax.' A third bystander, an eminent engineer, made the third comment, 'When will modern governments discover that war is old-fashioned?' Such a conversation among hard-headed business men is significant.

Let no one say that it was sentimental talk, however hard-headed the talkers. There are already places where war has become unthinkable. Four hundred years ago there was no more war-ridden ground than the Borders of England and Scotland. But to-day these wide uplands where armies marched and counter-marched and the moss-troopers rode by night and day are the most peaceful spot on God's earth. Flodden Field, where 'the Flowers of the Forest are a' wede away,' is the haunt of peace, and the monument erected in 1910 bears this inscription, 'To the brave of both nations.' If any one say, 'Yes; but England and Scotland are now united under one King and Government, we can't have undefended frontiers where two separate Governments and nations adjoin,' the answer is, 'Can we not? What about the United States of America and Canada?' A thousand miles of river, a thousand miles of lake, a thousand miles of prairie, a thousand miles of mountain, and not a fortress, not a cannon, not an armed sentinel for the whole four thousand miles.

Who taught us first and best that war is destined to become as obsolete as the weapons of far-off centuries of strife? Was it not Jesus Christ? He taught no slogan against either war or slavery or the other tyrannies of His time. But with the calmness of entire conviction He gave a vision of the blessedness of peace and of the inevitable ownership of the earth by the 'meek,' people of a patient and conciliatory disposition. He was indeed like a grown man watching little boys furiously quarrelling over trifles, and setting Himself to help them to grow beyond it.

What He taught is as applicable to private life and intercourse as to national life and intercourse. He taught us to avoid bitterness, to cultivate magnanimity, to cherish courtesy, to acquire the non-antagonistic mind. There are still to be found business men who hint that you must treat every man as a rogue till he is proved to be an honest man, that you must constantly stand up for your rights because no one else will. But the intelligent man of affairs in this land at least knows that these are worn-out maxims.

4. There is one other illustration of this principle which is of great importance. What was Jesus' attitude to Paganism? There were very few who worshipped only one God save the Jews. Throughout the Roman Empire, gods and goddesses were worshipped, Jupiter and Venus, Zeus and Aphrodite, Isis and Osiris. The plague of sexuality was over it all, though the finer minds had attempted to explain it away.

Now Jesus did not attack idolatry. When a handful of Greeks visited Him, there is no record that He attacked their religion. He made few references to Paganism save to point to it as a lower way of life and religion. What, then, did He do? He presented in His teaching the Father, implacably pure and unceasingly kind. He presented Himself as the Lover and Saviour and Comrade of mankind, perfectly human and irrevocably Divine. He was what the heart of man wants and the conscience of man demands. What was the result? The altars of the gods are deserted to-day. The modern man may fail to welcome Jesus, but He cannot resist His influence. There are many who do not receive the message of Christianity, but they know that no religion has any chance in the future unless it embody the worship of a Father-God.

This is most manifest when we consider how antiquated every sacrificial system has become. Jesus did not attack the sacrifices in the Temple in Jerusalem. But wherever the message of His own

death on the Cross has gone, in due course sacrifices automatically cease. It was Harnack, the famous German professor, who said that wherever the story of Christ's sacrifice is told, the altars cease to smoke and the blood of the sacrifice to flow. It is so even in Jewry. Under the Zionist movement thousands of Jews have been repatriated on the soil of their fathers. Much money has been spent on their settlement in Palestine. There is no proposal to reinstate the sacrifices of the Temple. How significant! Jesus has made blood-sacrifices finally obsolete.

5. Will we let Christ show us, then, what we have to outgrow? The prejudices and the trivial-

ities, the treasures open to moth and rust, the human splendours which so quickly fade, the joys with bitterness in their hearts, the will-o'-the-wisps of the human quest—what has Christ to say of them and of us clutching at them, hoarding them, spending body and soul to get them? He says very little about them, just notes them and says, 'Come, walk with me, and these things will more and more lose their fascination.' St. Paul understood when he wrote: 'When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child: now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things.'¹

¹ R. C. Gillie, *The Gospel for the Modern Mind*, 18.

The New Anglican Commentary.²

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., UNION SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

SINCE the *Speaker's Commentary*, written 'by clergy of the Anglican Church,' was published in last century, Biblical criticism has advanced and altered within the Church of England as elsewhere. The present Commentary is intended to mark the progress of criticism, or rather, as the editors put it, to let Anglican scholars to-day set forth their conclusions—scholars who 'have not found the results of legitimate criticism to conflict with the Catholic faith.' Unlike the *Speaker's Commentary*, however, this is in one volume; it does not print the Biblical text, as readers are assumed to possess the Revised Version; and it contains a number of general articles on history, geography, and theology. One's first duty is to congratulate the editors and the publishers on their achievement. Any competent work is welcome which endeavours to educate the public on the Bible. Misconceptions require to be removed from the mind, fresh discoveries (in archæology, for example) have to be assimilated, and traditional renderings need to be revised or abandoned. It is all to the good when such scattered contributions to the better knowledge of the Bible are gathered together and sifted frankly. This the editors have attempted to do, and we wish them every success. Their work will be appreciated

far beyond the borders of their own communion. They have produced a book which is wonderfully cheap, which has a certain unity of outlook, which is religious in its tone without being homiletical, and which externally is pleasant and easy to handle. There are a few misprints: 'Welsh' for 'Welch,' 'pracsise,' and 'Selucid,' are the sort of minor errata which in a large book are inevitable, and such, so far as I have seen, are not numerous. The review copy sent to me does lack pp. 497-527, but that is a mistake of the binders. On the whole the get-up of the volume is excellent. A fuller index, however, would have been appreciated.

Like Dr. Peake's one-volume Commentary, it aims at an audience which is not able to use the original texts, and also at an interpretation which is religious or spiritual. Written for 'the ministers of religion' and for the laity, this work is intended, the editors assure us, to further the spiritual use of the Bible in the Church. Dr. Gore's opening essay claims that the Anglican Church, not the Roman, is the genuine trustee of the ancient liberty of the Church in dealing with the Scriptures, and is therefore bound to teach the faith 'without which the Church cannot live, and which is older even than the New Testament,' which is assumed in the New Testament writings. Great care has been taken to stress the religious setting of the New Testament especially in the life of the contemporary Church. And as the Bible was

² *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, including the Apocrypha*, ed. by Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, Alfred Guillaume (S.P.C.K.; 16s. net).

meant for the Church originally, so its function is still emphasized by most of the contributors. Thus on Job 34²⁹ we read: 'Peake is undoubtedly right in rendering *If He remain quiet, who can condemn?* The hardest thing to bear is God's inactivity or "quietness" amid the horrors of war or the desolating sorrows of life.' Again, on Mt 21¹⁹, this frank comment occurs: "'The Legacy of Israel" to the world is the legacy of its life and witness before it made the "great refusal," the legacy of the faithful remnant which passed over into the Catholic Church. What has it given to the world since but the ever-present warning of its punishment?' In this connexion the place of mystical interpretation has been occasionally noted. There is a place for this, but it requires a more analytic handling of the data of inspiration in literature than has been recognized; the older 'typical' interpretation of the O.T. has been justly discredited, but it did grope after a truth which ought to be restated in terms of modern psychology and literary criticism. And this has not really been attempted. For example, the comment on the Parable of the Good Samaritan is that 'the great story needs no comment, only constant remembrance and imitation. On the mystical interpretation, which is very edifying, see Trench, *Parables*.' In any case this comment is too curt; the parable does require serious study. But many students feel that the mystical interpretation here is among the weakest and most superfluous examples of the method in question. The words of the Bible, as of any classic, come to have a larger meaning than that originally meant by the writers. But the spiritual or mystical interpretation has often produced a sense of utter unreality, unluckily.

The Apocrypha has fared happily, in the hands of scholars like Dr. Oesterley, Mr. Thackeray, Mr. Bevan, and Mr. Hunkin. Within their limits they have managed to compress just the sort of information which the general reader requires. The Old Testament has in the main been well served. Professor Burkitt's paper on the prophets makes us wish he had been entrusted with more to do; it has the rare quality of distinction. Also we would have liked more from Dr. W. E. Barnes, and something from Mr. G. R. Driver. But the level is well maintained, and an essay like that on the Old Testament in the light of anthropology and archæology, by Mr. E. O. James, will clear up the minds of many readers; it might have been printed with advantage early in the volume instead of at the end of the Old Testament section. The

editors are outspoken in this section. They recognize the legendary elements in the stories of the patriarchs: 'Esther and Daniel are not properly history at all, but edifying stories on a remote basis of tradition,' and so forth. But, they add (and the italics are their own), '*After all the real importance of history lies in perceiving what it is coming to—what is its tendency.*' It is a singular gain to have such candour combined with religious perception, in a work thus intended for popular use. No one after reading contributions, for example, like those by Dr. Guillaume and Canon Battersby Harford—to name only two of the keenest in the team—can fail to possess a surer sense of reality in the Old Testament.

The New Testament, I confess, seems to be treated with rather less thoroughness and critical freedom. Not that the writers of the Commentary are unduly conservative, by any means. On the story of the coin in the mouth of the fish, for example, we are told that 'frequently it is impossible to accept our Lord's teaching and reject the miracles associated with it; the two are bound up together. Here it is not so. Our Lord's beautiful words about sonship do not involve the acceptance of the miracle.' As for the destruction of the Gadarene swine, the comment is that 'it is another illustration of our changed attitude to the infallibility of the Bible record that we should like to think that Mark is in error in connecting their destruction with anything said or willed by the Lord.' Perhaps that is the true solution. Similarly with the Apostle Paul; with regard to angels, for example, 'in view of what we now know of the sources of the later Jewish angelology, we may not accept with confidence all that he accepts.' But one has the feeling that sound, critical principles might have been carried a little further, with profit to the reader. For example, when Luke tells how the risen Jesus ate a piece of broiled fish in presence of the disciples, it is surely not rationalistic to suggest that this is a naïve touch of realism on the part of the writer. Dr. Gore never alludes to this possibility; but if he allows, as he fairly does, a little lower, that Luke was attributing more to the Master than he really said, when he made Jesus declare that His resurrection on the third day had been predicted in the Scripture, does not the principle in the one case cover the difficulty in the other? Dr. Turner's splendid commentary on the Gospel of Mark exhibits the use of true freedom, for example, in dealing with the canonical text of the New Testament; it is a masterpiece of interpretation, from which all may learn; it has

judgment and originality of the best kind ; it does not hesitate to differ from fashionable novelties of criticism as well as from traditional interpretations. I wish something of the same liberty had been exercised more often in handling the historical problems of the life of Jesus ; for, whilst there is a good case for the point of view adopted here, it would have been strengthened if it had been less rigid at several points, particularly in connexion with the question of the miraculous, where the just sense of responsibility may be too much for the spirit of wisdom.

Dr. E. J. Picknell's notes on Acts are good reading ; it must have been hard to construct a commentary on the lines required, but he has succeeded in conveying the spirit of the book and in bringing out its movement. Once, I think, he has been too subtle ; in suggesting the possibility that presbyters were not the same as 'episcopoi' in the apostolic age, he argues that when Paul addressed the presbyters at Ephesus (Ac 20²⁸) as *episcopoi*, 'a wave of his hand would be enough to make it plain that he was now addressing not all the elders, but only those to whom the further duty of oversight had been granted.' To put it mildly, this sounds far-fetched. Another exegetical oddity is the description of 'the love of God' in Ro 4⁵ as our love to God. This has been held, but the evidence against it is generally taken by scholars to be decisive, so decisive that the possibility of the other rendering ought at least to have been mentioned. On Ex 20¹⁷ it is noted that 'Do not defraud' in Mk 10¹⁹ is an echo of the tenth commandment ; but on Mark the real exegesis is given, showing that the words are an echo of the eighth commandment, if they are an echo of anything. In passing, I may observe that one feature of the literature is occasionally missed. Justice has been done, in the Old Testament, to the transposition of certain passages in the text, e.g. Is 41^{6, 7} and Job 28^{10, 11} ; but further use might have been made of this method to clear up Jer 21^{11, 12}, for example, Zec 3^{4, 5} and Mic 2^{12, 13}. Dr. Lock regards disarrangement as possible in some sections of the Fourth Gospel, but the theory is not worked out. Dr. Goudge admits the justification of the principle in the literary criticism of the Apocalypse, particularly in the closing chapters.

In forthcoming editions of the Commentary I hope the editors will pay more strict attention to the bibliographies. In Dr. Peake's Commentary these were a special feature. Here they vary ; sometimes there are none at all, sometimes foreign work is ignored, and often important foreign and

even English works¹ are passed over. It ought to be borne in mind that the object of bibliography is to aid the student in further study, and, competently done, a note of the best literature is most educative. The bibliographies, however, are frequently defective in this Commentary. Unless I am mistaken, for example, the reader would never know that Lagrange, the great French scholar, had written some of the finest commentaries on the New Testament ; one or two are tucked away in the bibliography at the end of the article on 'The Sacred Sites of the Gospel'—I mean, the names of them are. But his commentary on Judges is ignored, and so is his edition of Romans. French work has indeed failed to win proper appreciation ; even Dhorme's contribution to the Books of Samuel has been ignored ; so has Condamin's on Jeremiah, and Podechard's on Ecclesiastes. The German work has also been fitfully acknowledged ; Feldmann's book on the Wisdom of Solomon should have been brought to the notice of English readers ; so, I think, should Caspari's on the Books of Samuel, and Sanda's on Kings. But the New Testament has fared worse still, for the reader is never told of standard works like those of P. Ewald on Ephesians, of Riggenbach on Hebrews, and of Zahn or Bousset or Lohmeyer on the Apocalypse. In bibliography of this kind, as in poetry, the safe rule is : either the best or none at all.

It would not be fair to end this notice, however, on a chord of criticism. What has been done has been done on the whole extremely well, tested by a stiff standard. With regard to the general point of view, it may be said that the editors deserve warm thanks for reminding readers that the Bible is not to be isolated from the Church ; not all will agree with the details of their argument, nor with their inferences in every respect, but the position was worth stating. The spirit of the Bible is not to be grasped, unless it is read as the literature of a worshipping community, and one merit of this Commentary is that such a focus is never lost sight of. Another merit is the collection of salient data for the interpretation of the religious ideas, and the uniform presentation of the same—uniform, without being stereotyped. It is certain that the publica-

¹ The reader ought to have been sent on to Burton's edition of Galatians, to Kennedy's Philippians, and to Peake on Colossians, for instance. And, in the Old Testament, there is no reference to Dr. W. H. Bennett's fine book on Chronicles in *The Expositor's Bible*, though it does exactly what the Commentary desiderates.

tion of this Commentary will lead to animated discussion, for it initiates many people into views which may be at first unwelcome. But it marks a stage in the education of the public mind. It will reach thousands who are not reached by ordinary

critical text-books, and the spirit in which it has been executed is all the more likely to be persuasive since it is, in the best sense of the terms, both candid and ironical. To sum up, the book is timely, full of stimulus, and a genuine guide.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

VI.

PART II. *B (continued).*

3. Dt 12¹⁻²⁸. Four times over (vv. 5-7, 11-12, 13-14, 26-28), it is here laid down that all sacrifices, tithes, and vows are to be brought to the place chosen by Jehovah, and (vv. 2-3) all rival places are to be destroyed or (v. 13) passed by. But (vv. 20-26, 15-16) distance would make it a great hardship if, when the Israelites were spread over the land of their inheritance, they could only eat of flock or herd at the one centre. Permission is therefore given to them to kill and eat non-sacrificially within their own gates. To such a feast the ceremonially unclean could come. Only the blood must be poured out upon the earth as water. So far Wellhausen and Wiener agree. Difference begins when we ask: What was the occasion which led to this ordinance being laid down so emphatically? Wellhausen answers: 'We have here the embodiment of the prophetic views which inspired the reformation of Josiah. Up to this time sacrifice and feasting have taken place at a number of sanctuaries and altars. But now, in view of the heathen character of the worship at the high places, the order goes forth that at one place only is sacrifice to be offered. And, as a corollary to this, feasting is not henceforth to be tied to sacrifice, and Israel may feast at home.' (See Part I. A, II. and B, II. in Articles I. and II.).

Wiener repudiates this altogether. Moses is the legislator, and Israel is in the plains of Moab. In the first year after their arrival at Sinai the Israelites had been permitted to offer sacrifices at various local altars (Ex 20²⁴), but this permission was abused, and therefore in the second year was superseded by a new rule which forbade sacrifice anywhere except at the door of the Tabernacle (Lv 17). Under this rule they had lived for nearly forty years. But now they are about to enter

Canaan, and Dt 12 lays down an amended rule to meet the new conditions. At the three pilgrimage seasons they must still offer sacrifices at a central sanctuary, but at other times Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ is to be once more in force, and both non-sacrificial slaughter at home and sacrifices at local 'lay altars' are to be again permitted (*Essays*, p. 193).

Is this view possible? In confirmation of it, Wiener advances five considerations:

- (i) This whole legislation is expressly said to be spoken by Moses (4⁴⁴ 5¹).
- (ii) Dt 12⁵⁻⁷, etc., refer to statutory offerings, and do not touch the customary offerings of Ex 20²⁴.
- (iii) Dt 12²¹ and 16²¹ expressly recognize the altars of Ex 20.
- (iv) It is unthinkable that public worship should be restricted to the Pilgrimage seasons.
- (v) Semitic usage, ancient and modern, exhibits a dual system of sacrifice.

We will consider each of these in turn.

i. Wiener has the initial advantage that in form this chapter purports to be spoken by Moses in the Plains of Moab. But (a), as we saw in connexion with Lv 17, it is not safe to take everything at its face value. V.⁸, e.g., bids us pause. If, as Wiener holds, the Tabernacle with all its elaborate ritual and its three Orders of Ministers had been set up by Moses in the wilderness and it had been the centre of camp life for nearly forty years, can we imagine him saying to Israel, 'Ye shall not do after all the things that *we* (emphatic in Heb.) are doing here this day, every man that which is right in his own eyes,' and contrasting the present lack of order with the future happier days of rest and security when it would be possible to set up a central 'place' of Jehovah's choosing to

which all could resort? Whatever the date of Deuteronomy, it seems clear that the author had no idea that a centralized system of worship had been set up in the wilderness. His conception of the wilderness life seems to have been much more like that in the days of the Judges (Jg 17⁶ 21²⁵). Wiener points to the Moabite (according to P, Midianite) apostasy (Nu 25) as exemplifying the religious lawlessness of v.⁸, but this verse speaks of something much more universal and irremediable than a temporary outbreak which, according to the story of Nu 25, was speedily stamped out by the religious authorities.

(b) Moreover, there are many indications that Dt 12 was not all spoken or written at one time. Its repetitions and its varied phraseology point to its being composed of at least two, probably four, sections, vv. 1-7, 8-12, 13-19, 20-28 (see Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 47 f., and Carpenter and Harford, *The Hexateuch*, vol. ii. p. 268). If so, it could hardly have been spoken by one man at one time. (On the whole question of the compilation of Deuteronomy, see *Since Wellhausen*, art. 4, pp. 91 f., and *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, pp. 147-148.)

ii. Wiener has to meet the difficulty from his point of view that chapter 12 repeatedly says that Israelites are to bring their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices, etc., to the one central 'place,' and to offer them there upon (v.²⁷) 'the altar of Jehovah thy God,' whereas Ex 20 bids the Israelites offer their burnt-offerings and their peace-offerings upon local altars of earth or unhewn stone. He tries to meet it by saying (*Essays*, pp. 195, 199-203) that Ex 20 refers to 'customary' offerings which Moses found in regular use and which he was content to retain and regulate before Lv 17 was in force and after it was superseded, whereas Dt 12 refers to 'statutory' offerings, which by Divine command were to be offered only at the central place. In Ex 20, therefore, the phrase meant 'all such burnt-offerings and peace-offerings as thou mayest offer in accordance with the existing custom as to lay sacrifice, but not other burnt-offerings and peace-offerings which do not fall within this custom,' and in Dt 12 the similar phrase meant the statutory offerings of Leviticus which were to be brought to the central altar, and did not refer to the customary sacrifices at all. This is a very forced explanation and without any solid foundation. There is nothing in the wording of Exodus or Deuteronomy making any such discrimination. How was the ordinary Israelite to whom Deuteronomy was in any view addressed (see, e.g., 5¹ 6^{1,2} 11²⁻⁷, etc.) to

realize that such distinctions were to be read between the lines? Would he not naturally take the burnt-offerings and sacrifices in Deuteronomy to mean all such offerings, especially when he is told that when he wants to kill of his flock or herd at home, he can do so non-sacrificially? Wiener makes much of the fact that the list of offerings to be brought to the central sanctuary are not exhaustive. Because tithe, animals, new moon, Sabbath, family, and local celebrations are not specifically mentioned, these, he says, must be intended to go on locally as before. But if their non-mention means that they do not come within the scope of the centralizing ordinance of Dt 12, because they are not statutory offerings to be offered centrally, then what are we to make of the fact that some of the most important of the statutory offerings, as laid down in Lv 1-7, viz. meal-, sin-, and guilt-offerings are also not mentioned? Are they not statutory after all, and are they not as important as tithes and vows, which are mentioned? Are they, being unmentioned, to be offered on local altars? The fact is that Wiener is quite right in saying that the sacrifices of Ex 20 were customary, and that those in Lv 1-7 were expressed in statute form. That is no new discovery. Every critic teaches the same—so, e.g., Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 339: 'A code is of necessity the final result and crystallized form of such a living, divine Torah, just as in all nations consuetudinary and judge-made law precedes codification and statute law.' But what Wiener fails to see is that the two represent, the one the beginning, and the other the end, of a long process, in the course of which the one gradually merged into the other. As the history shows, primitive custom regulated the matter and manner of sacrifice in Old Israel. Deuteronomy did not alter these sacrifices, but laid down that they should no longer be offered under the debased conditions of the high places, but should all be brought to the central sanctuary. At the same time it provided for local feasting (v.²¹) at a distance from the central sanctuary by laying down that local slaughter for food should no longer be sacrificial. It is only when we come to the Exilic and post-Exilic period that the sacrificial rites and regulations which had become the rule in Jerusalem appear in codified form in Leviticus. Wiener's further argument as to the difference between 'substantive law' and 'procedure' is equally fallacious. It is based on the same inability to realize the long history that lies behind the laws of 'procedure' in Leviticus.

iii. Wiener (*The Altars*, p. 18, *Fundamental*

Errors, Monatsschrift, p. 362) claims Dt 12²¹ and 16²¹ as showing that the altars of Ex 20^{24, 25} are expressly recognized by the law-giver in Deuteronomy. It requires considerable audacity to claim 12²¹ as so doing, when there is no mention of an altar either in this verse or in the parallel v. 15, and when these non-sacrificial slaughterings are expressly contrasted with the sacrifices which (vv. 26, 27) were to be 'offered upon the altar of Jehovah thy God' at the place of Jehovah's choice. Wiener can only give the slightest semblance of reason for such a claim by laying down (a) that the altar of Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ was used for non-sacrificial as well as sacrificial slaughter, and (b) that 'as I have commanded thee' in Dt 12²¹ points back to Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶, but as we have seen good reason for turning down the former view (see Art. V. B, II. i.-ii.), and as the latter phrase much more naturally refers to v. 15, we must reject his view of 12²¹ as quite untenable.

As to Dt 16²¹ there is fairly general agreement that this passage, prohibiting Ashera and Pillar 'beside the altar of Jehovah thy God,' refers to altars of Jehovah in high places of the older period, and that it is a relic which survived such revision of laws as was carried out, when the law of the one sanctuary was put at the head of the collection of earlier laws. It may well have been felt that, until the new régime was firmly established, it still had its value. Wiener says that it is 'generally recognized as referring to "cairn" altars,' but this is not at all the case. It refers to high place altars, and these were horn altars at least as early as Amos. To say, as Wiener does (*Essays*, p. 195), that no law-giver would recognize as lawful in one chapter what he had just prohibited in another would have some force, if we could accept the view that Moses was the author of both chapters as they stand; but that, as we have seen, we cannot do.

iv. Again, Wiener (*The Altars*, p. 18; *Fundamental Errors*, p. 363), starting from the premiss that 'in the whole pre-Exilic age all public service was sacrificial,' argues that 'to confine all sacrificial worship to one religious centre would have been to abolish all public worship for all Israel except at the Pilgrimages.' 'This,' he says, 'is surely unthinkable.' 'Local public worship would be necessary,' he argues, 'for the celebration of Sabbath and New Moon, family anniversaries, local festivals and probably tithe-animals.' Wiener is quite right in saying that it is unthinkable that for all the period between the crossing of Jordan and the reformation of Josiah all public sacrificial worship would be forbidden except at the one centre. But

if, as Wiener maintains, Deuteronomy⁷ is Mosaic as it stands, that is just what it does say. The truth is that, at the time when Deuteronomy laid down that the feasts 'within thy gates' were to be non-sacrificial, Israel was not just about to enter Canaan, but had been deprived of most of its territory and 'had practically become the City of Jerusalem with its dependent towns' (Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 147). The one sanctuary sufficed for the sacrificial needs of the people, thus situated, and family and other feastings were provided for non-sacrificially. If we may judge from 1 S 9¹²⁻²⁴, at local festivals the feasting was at the best of times the main consideration in Old Israel, the sacrificial part of the function being performed behind the scenes. The ordinary Israelite would hardly notice the change, and he would appreciate the fact that ceremonial uncleanness no longer disqualified him from partaking of the feast. As bearing upon this point of public worship away from the centre, Wiener quotes Wellhausen's remark in regard to Old Israel that 'any strict centralization is for that period inconceivable in the sphere of Divine worship as in every other sphere,' and he comments that this was true 'for every period except that of the desert wanderings, and a strict centralization of sacrificial worship is only possible after Divine worship has been almost divorced from sacrifice' (*Fundamental Errors*, p. 363). In a footnote elsewhere (*The Altars*, p. 21 f.) he says: 'the pilgrimage laws of the Pentateuch presuppose a population with the mobility of Bedouin settled on a small territory' and 'they became continually less capable of execution. They had in view a population all the members of which would habitually be within easy reach of the religious centre.' Do not these statements, when pondered over, suggest that, on Wiener's own showing, the Israel, for whom the pilgrimage laws were laid down, could not have been the nation which was just about to leave the desert behind and to spread over a wide territory, but rather was the nation when its numbers and its territory had been reduced to a remnant of its former population and size? When the priests after the Exile had set up a centralized sacrificial worship, it was easy for them to imagine such worship as having already existed in the wilderness, because that period lends itself to such treatment.

v. In *The Altars of the Old Testament* (pp. 18-20; cf. *Fundamental Errors*, pp. 10-11), Wiener elaborates one more argument. 'Duality of the places of sacrifice,' he says quite justly, 'was a

feature of early Semitic worship.' 'If Balaam and Balak raise impromptu altars, Moab nevertheless boasted permanent high places (notice the plural, J. B. H.) and a sacerdotal system (Is 15², Jer 48⁷⁻³⁵). . . . Similarly in the Palestine of to-day we find pilgrimage and local sacrifices side by side. Thus S. I. Curtiss writes as follows: "There are two primitive places of sacrifice—(a) at the shrine of some being who has the value of God to the worshipper—these shrines vary from a circular wall of stones around a supposed grave—to a building known as a Kubbeh . . . (b) at the dwelling of the one offering it, whether that be cave, tent, or permanent dwelling." This dual system was familiar to every Israelite.' At this point we expect to have evidence from history that the same dual system obtained in Old Israel, but, instead of that, Wiener turns to the Pentateuchal Law. Moses, he says, (a) 'regulated the system of local worship,' and (b) 'substituted one great religious capital for the numerous centres usual in the heathen religions,' and these two laws ran concurrently. He then attacks Wellhausen for ignoring this duality and constructing a theory, according to which the law of local sacrifices prevailed alone up to 621 B.C., while after that date a new law took its place, which set up one central sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy.

As soon as we turn to the history, this whole argument falls to pieces. As Wellhausen showed conclusively, there did exist in Old Israel, not the dualism which Wiener pictures, but a dualism which exactly answered to that which obtained among neighbouring peoples at the time and still obtains to-day, viz. (a) local altars near a man's own home, and (b) numerous sanctuaries of more or less repute to which people flocked from far and near at certain times of the year. And when Wiener turns from law to history (*The Altars*, pp. 20-22), he practically reads it in the same way. The law, according to him, was quite definite and clear, but 'a little while after the death of Moses—the Israelites were a scattered minority in a land the strong places of which were mostly in the hands of heathen races that were predominantly hostile. The ideal of one place as a centre to which the whole nation could make three pilgrimages a year in complete safety was unrealizable. Hence some compromises between the extreme demands of the law and the dictates of practical necessities were inevitable.' 'The political situation was long such that for the majority of the Israelites pilgrimages to Shiloh were quite impossible. Accordingly breaches of the strict law were necessary, and local sanctuaries served by priests (my italics,

J. B. H.) were inevitable. . . . There may have been sanctuaries of varying degrees of legality, and some of them were probably nothing more than old heathen high places of some baal. . . . If Zebulun and Issachar (Dt 33¹⁹) had a sanctuary that complied with the requirements of the law so far as circumstances permitted, it may well be that their cult was thoroughly consistent with the spirit of the legislation where the fulfilment of the letter was impossible.' Wiener agrees with Wellhausen that the compiler of Kings adopted an unhistorical view, when he condemned some of the best kings for allowing worship in the high places, but he does so for a different reason. Wellhausen is of opinion that the writer regarded the Deuteronomic law of the one sanctuary as having been in force from the first, whereas it was really of much later date. Wiener says that the writer was right in regarding Deuteronomy as Mosaic, but that he misunderstood it and thought that it condemned local sacrifices, whereas, as Wiener himself has discovered, in reality it did nothing of the kind (*Essays*, p. 192). This misreading of history by the writer of Kings henceforth prevailed. The post-Exilic view was that from the beginning there was only one legitimate place of sacrificial worship, and this view 'prevailed till the rise of the modern critical schools' (*The Altars*, p. 23).

We have carefully considered Wiener's fivefold argument, and we have seen that it breaks down in every single case. As a matter of fact the difference between Wellhausen and Wiener is not so much as to the historical happenings, but as to the date at which the law of the one central sanctuary was laid down. Wiener, believing that the only choice is between the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuchal Law and deliberate fraud, clings desperately to the former, although he recognizes that the law of the one central sanctuary was unrealizable from the moment that Israel entered into possession of the land of Canaan. Wellhausen believed that all the evidence went to show that no such impossible law was imposed upon Israel at the beginning of its national history; that in accordance with Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁸ sacrifices and offerings were made in Old Israel on the lines of primitive practice; that only when the earlier prophets had taught higher views of God and righteousness were efforts made (Dt and 2 K 23) to remedy abuses and to put down idolatry and immorality; and that the law of the one central sanctuary was then laid down in the name of Moses, which finally issued in the worship of the second Temple. It may safely be left to those who are able to weigh evidence impartially

and without *a priori* presuppositions to decide which of the two reads the facts correctly. We may sympathize with Wiener's desire to maintain Mosaic authorship, but when he says that Wellhausen's view means deliberate fraud on the part of the Deuteronomist and post-Exilic writers, our answer must be that such a verdict is the result of looking at the question from a modern and western

point of view. We may wish that another mode of presentation had been used, but it is clear that the method adopted was one which *in that age* was regarded as perfectly legitimate. It was probably the only one which at that time could have secured the acceptance of the new legislation, and, if God Himself did not disdain to permit and bless it, who are we that we should condemn?

Entre Nous.

'One trained soul can teach another.'

THAT one is dependent, absolutely dependent, in the development of the religious life on teaching by others was a basic belief of Baron von Hügel. As he put it colloquially to his niece, 'I never learnt anything myself by my own old nose.' 'The spiritual world is a great world of facts,' he said to her one time, 'and you must learn about it, as you would learn forestry from the forester. After five or six years among the trees you will know something about them. You are a goose if you cavil at that! I learnt all that I know from Huvelin. What I teach you is him, not me. I learnt it from him. What a great saint he was! and what he taught me! "One torch lights another torch" (Lucretius). One penitent soul awakens to the desire to teach other souls—in sufferings and dryness a more experienced soul can sustain the less. It is best to learn from others; it gives a touch of creatureliness.'

In a volume which has just been published by Messrs. Dent — *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece* (7s. 6d. net)—we have a proof of how faithfully he carried his belief into practice. During the six years before his death, he had regularly talked with his niece, Miss Gwendolen Greene. 'I want to prepare you, to organise you for life, for illness, crisis, and death.' And he wrote her a series of letters. They form the bulk of the present volume. They are prefaced by a valuable forty-five pages in which Miss Greene shows the most salient of her uncle's religious teachings, as they come back to her from the notes which she made of his talks.

Messrs. Dent have sent us a companion volume—*Readings from Friedrich von Hügel* (7s. 6d. net). There is an introductory essay by Algar Thorold. It is an illuminating and penetrating study of von

Hügel's teaching, and should be read alongside Miss Greene's introduction. For those who have not Baron von Hügel's three important works—'The Mystical Element of Religion,' 'Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion' (these two are published by Messrs. Dent), and 'Eternal Life' (published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark)—a volume of selections such as this is a necessity. The greatest religious thinker of the day, some have thought, certainly the greatest Roman Catholic thinker, Baron von Hügel had a picturesque and pungent way of putting things. Miss Greene has remembered and noted many characteristic phrases: 'Religion is like a cuckoo in some people's nest' (p. xxxi).

'God is not an idea. He is a fact' (p. xviii).

'I must wear my own top-hat, and also I must not kick any one else's top-hat' (p. xxx).

'Religion can't be clear if it is worth having' (p. xvii).

'Clever people never think' (p. xiii).

'Be silent about great things' (p. ix).

'I think we have got all our values wrong, and suffering is the crown of life' (p. xv).

Christianity a Heroism.

'People seem sometimes to think it is a dear darling, not-to-be-grumpy, not-to-be-impatient, not-to-be-violent life; a sort of wishy-washy sentimental affair. Stuff and nonsense! Christianity is not that. Christianity is an immense warning; a tremendous heroism. Christ teaches a great austerity. He teaches renunciation: the life of the Cross. He was not comfy. He had not where to lay his head. He was no rigorist, yet he tells us to die to ourselves, to take up the Cross, to follow him. Is that all comfy? . . .

'Young people seem absorbed nowadays in

getting their own way. Matthew Arnold says you can get so absorbed in heroism that *that* becomes your own way. But you can't have growth, if you do what you like as we ordinarily mean it, until we come again to live for duty and not for rights, to be busy with contrition for sin and not with comforts. God is in duty. The notion of being comfortable! How vulgar it is! God never makes our lives comfortable. Even in heaven I believe there will be an equivalent of suffering—not as it stands here—but the equivalent, suffering beatified. I feel sure of this.¹

Dr. George Reith.

No biographer could have been found more fitted to write the biography of Dr. George Reith than Dr. Clow. Dr. Clow had not only known Dr. Reith intimately for many years, but the whole of the background of his life was familiar to him. Indeed, it was his own background. For Dr. Clow is Principal Emeritus of the United Free Church College in Glasgow, and it was in the most influential church in Glasgow—the College Church—that Dr. Reith spent his long ministry of fifty years. But more important still, Dr. Clow was in close mental and spiritual sympathy with Dr. Reith. The biography is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton—the title is *Dr. George Reith: A Scottish Ministry* (7s. 6d. net). It is a dignified biography, slow moving perhaps, but that is because Dr. Clow knows the value of a background. 'George Reith was born in the city of Aberdeen on 9th July 1842, ten months before that Disruption which rent the Church of Scotland in twain. As he was wont to say, he was not free-born, but he was carried in his mother's arms into the Free Church of Scotland.' With Dr. Clow's help one feels the strong evangelical atmosphere of the time. It would be difficult to find a better picture of Scottish character and environment than we have here.

The facts of Dr. Reith's life are simple and are quickly told. Educated at the Grammar School of Aberdeen, he went on to the University, and then, in 1861, graduated with such honours that he was offered a cadetship in the Indian Army. Of this time he himself wrote later: 'My parents had dedicated me to the ministry at the Disruption, and I was never allowed to forget it. When I had finished with the University, and several tempting offers were made to me, I hesitated for a little, much to my father's alarm. One day I found on

my table the Life of David Sandeman—laid there on purpose by him. That rebuked, and settled me, and without delay I began to study for the ministry. Thank God for His goodness in permitting me to serve Him in that ministry for so many years.' At the early age of twenty-four he began his ministry in Glasgow. He closed it fifty years later with a sermon on the text, 'Come and see'—'Come and see Jesus Christ in His fullness of grace and truth.' Principal Denney was a worshipper in the College Church, and he bore witness in the General Assembly that Dr. Reith 'was one who made his ministry great, in that he found the task of preaching so absorbing and so sublime, that it left no room for any rival interest than to lead men into the secret of the Lord, that they might be conformed to his likeness.' It is told that a Highland elder, attending the Assembly for the first time, leaned forward at the conclusion of the prayer of intercession and asked of one seated before him, 'Who is that?' 'Dr. George Reith of Glasgow,' was the reply. 'There came the quiet comment, "He is a man of God."'

Entirely without self-seeking and entirely fearless Dr. Reith again and again took an unpopular course. In every one of the historical heresy hunts, says Dr. Clow, Dr. Reith was 'a stalwart apologist of the accused. His personal affection for Dr. Marcus Dods and for Professor A. B. Bruce drew him into the front line of their defence. His championship of Professor Robertson Smith was more expressed and unfaltering than some thought it required to be.' In the closing words of his defence of Professor Robertson Smith he said: 'Yet, meanwhile, I am more concerned for my Church than for Professor Robertson Smith, much as I esteem him and love him. It is not to clear him of this charge, so much as to vindicate for the Church of my Lord the right of being the leader of reverent thought on the Bible and its message. I am jealous for her, that while believing and maintaining the old faith, she may prove not only unafraid of fresh light, but be also the source, through her sons—men of gifts and character—of enriching blessing to the world. I esteem and I honour my friend, but I esteem and I honour my Church much more. I am jealous for her right to be regarded as the representative Church of the land, holding with a firm hand the truth which is her hereditary privilege and her sacred possession—even her divine trust—while she allows her official teachers the liberty which the fearless love of truth demands, and to have it ever freshened so as to be a living guide and not a dead thing of the past.'

¹ *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece*, xix ff.

As revealing as anything in the biography are Dr. Reith's letters to his youngest son. One of these is quoted below.

Christ is there.

'What do I think heaven is like? And how much am I looking forward to it?

'To take the second question first—I am trying to fix my thoughts daily on the end which cannot be very far away at my time of life. This means the effort to imagine myself in the Presence of my Judge, with all the vanity of this world and its make-believe stripped away, and nothing left but reality. We so often and so largely "walk in a vain show" here. But there—at the judgment-seat of Christ we shall be manifested as we are. "If Thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand?" Under a sense of my sin and unworthiness I hide myself beneath the righteousness of my Saviour. "Nothing in my hands I bring, simply to Thy cross I cling." "Hide me, O my Saviour, hide, Beneath the shadow of Thy wings." This is how I look forward to eternity, and I do so every day and almost every hour I live.

'The second question is, What do I think of heaven? Heaven to me is just the Presence of Jesus Christ. I can hardly ever get beyond that. It is good to think of the white-robed multitudes; of all the dear ones who have gone on their way before us; of all the inexpressible joys and glory that must await the redeemed, and among which the mind gets lost. But I always come back to the main thing—the vision of the Lamb in the midst of the throne—that marvellous union of God and man: and my mind rests there. Heaven is Christ. And then, too, is it not said that we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is? That is heaven to the Redeemed.

'God bless you, and may you and I be counted worthy to enter through the gates into the city. There is but one way—as you know.'¹

Conversion.

Those who have forgotten that interesting biography of Laurence Oliphant written by Mrs. Oliphant should refresh their memory. A book which has just come in made us get it out of the shelves again. What a strange, brilliant man he was, whose sacrifices seemed to him the simplest necessity. Not only his own renunciation but that of his wife was almost unparalleled. The account of their lives with the Harris community at Brocton, and then later at Haifa in Palestine,

made interesting reading again. About a year before his own death his wife Alice died, but her death only seemed to bring them nearer. He goes on with the writing of his 'Sympneumata,' and says in a letter: 'Alice is doing wonders, and developing ideas in me of which I had no conception. It is therefore as interesting to write as a novel, for I never know what is coming next.' In the same year—1888—we find that he is writing to his friends about his projected second marriage: 'She realises Alice most intensely, and brings her closer to me than I ever felt her.'

My Perilous Life in Palestine (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is the autobiography of Laurence Oliphant's second wife. She was Rosamond Dale Owen, a daughter of Robert Dale Owen, and a granddaughter of Robert Owen, the founder of the New Harmony Community. She is a very old woman now—almost eighty in fact. She starts the autobiography with an account of Laurence Oliphant and their marriage, and his death so soon after. And then she gives the story of the first forty-five years of her life before she met her husband.

On page 150 she tells of her conversion—'One Sunday morning my cousin asked me to go to church with her. "My dear Isabel," I said, "you know I don't care to go to church, long ceremonies do not appeal to me." "Well, then, come in order to be polite," she said. . . .

'My cousin had scarcely resumed her seat when my whole being was roused and thrilled by the sight which I saw. On the Altar stood the most glorious Figure I had ever looked on, so glorious that no imagination of mine could have painted it, for its splendour was beyond my range of conception. I had never dreamt that such power and such sweetness could exist; and yet it was a man, with the familiar lineaments I was daily accustomed to seeing. Heaven and earth were joined. For a moment His wonderful eyes looked down at the Communicants, and then He turned and stretched out His arms to me. I ran headlong to the Altar, and knelt with the others, hiding my face because I could not bear His splendour. When I looked up, the Form was gone. . . . Strong He was as an Archangel, and yet gentle as the meekest creature that breathes. It was this union of force and exquisitely yielding sweetness which astounded me; for in all the pictures of Christ which I have seen, the gentleness borders almost on weakness, and there is no trace of the all-searching mentality, the overpowering virility, which I perceived in this perfect God-man.'

¹ Letter of Dr. George Reith to his youngest son.

From the time of her conversion Rosamond Dale Owen never felt that she was left undirected. She had a Voice which gave her commands about the most minute actions. 'The next morning, Monday, the Voice began my education as a Christian, and my first command was: "Put your bureau drawers in better order, for were God as disorderly as you are, the Cosmos would return to chaos."' It may be that the reader will think that there is a lack of this same order in the autobiography.

Rosamond Dale Owen has published several works—and in addition to these she has worked for many years on what she intends to be a complete statement of her philosophy; a good deal of it has crept into the autobiography.

Engines must Condense.

We have sampled many a time, and with profit, the talks on religion and life of the Rev. Archibald Alexander. Now, in *Sparrows in the Organ* (3s. 6d. net), we find that Dr. Alexander has the gift—how uncommon it is—of speaking to children also. He finds certain desiderata in every children's sermon. 'First of all, be interesting not merely to the parents but to the children.' The talk 'must be very short with, as a rule, not more than one idea in it.' It 'must not be too solemn.' And in this case practice follows theory.

'At King's Cross Station on the Underground, by the side of a tunnel which is used both by steam trains and electric ones, you will see this notice printed in big letters, "Engines must condense."

'What does that mean? It means that engines are not to go into that tunnel puffing steam and smoke hard out of the funnel, because that would make the air choky and unpleasant for the people in the electric trains passing through it all day. So the steam engines that work there are fitted with a condenser which turns their steam into water. They are required to consume their own steam, to bottle it up, and not let it out with a snort. The order on entering that tunnel is, "Engines must condense."

'Imagine an engine coming along at a great pace, bursting with keenness, and saying, "Watch me take these old waggons along!" getting its eye on the notice as it came to the tunnel—and all at once simmering down, swallowing very hard, and saying, "Oh, all right! I'll go quietly. I'll not make a row in the tunnel. Look, all my steam is now going into the condenser, and there's none coming out of my funnel at all!"

"Engines must condense" is a good motto—for engines that work in a tunnel.

'On a certain nursery wall I once saw a notice not unlike that. It said, "Count Ten." That was all. Just "Count Ten." It was a reminder to the little people in that nursery who were inclined to lose their temper or go off in a pet or be disagreeable to count ten first; and the idea was that, if they did that, the fit of temper, or whatever it was, would pass. . . .

"Count Ten" is a good motto, but it is not the best.

'The best I know hangs on the wall of a house I used to visit. It said, "Jesus Christ is the Head of this house, the unseen Guest at every meal, the silent Listener to every conversation."

'If Jesus is our Friend—and He wants to be—and we desire always to please Him, if we remember that He is with us all day and every day, then, for His sake, and because it is His Will, we'll keep back the angry word, restrain the quick temper and speak gently.

"Engines must condense" is a fine motto—for engines; and people who are still in nurseries may get help from counting ten; but, for you and me, the surest way to act rightly is to remember Jesus, and to try to follow Him.'

Another talk begins: 'There is a very large and most useful book, in twelve large volumes, which some ministers are lucky enough to possess, whose full name is too long and hard to trouble you with but whose nickname among its friends is the "E.R.E." It might be too hard a task to guess which article gave Dr. Alexander his inspiration here, so we will reveal the fact that it is the one on Yawning. But how does this illustrate the text, 'Renew a right spirit within me'?

The publisher of Dr. Alexander's volume is Mr. H. R. Allenson. From this firm also comes *Sunday Morning Stories* (5s. net), by the Rev. William J. May. Mr. May has another, but also an effective, way of speaking to children. He has made the telling of stories particularly his own. Here there are two types, Nature parables and stories from the Bible itself 'dressed up in bright colours.' From these volumes parents might find the material for Sunday afternoon talks with the children.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.